DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 073 SO 024 104

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE Peace Education--How? A Discussion of Steps and Measures To Be Taken. Peace Education Reports No. 11.
INSTITUTION School of Education, Malmo (Sweden). Dept. of Educational and Psychological Research.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6426
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 67p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational and Psychological Research, School of Education, Lund University, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; *Educational Objectives; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Peace; *Social Studies; Social Values; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This document discusses and documents the answers that 50 experts representing 22 countries gave to two questions: (1) Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? and (2) If so, what are some to the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first? Part 1 of the report attempts to summarize some major aspects of the answers, while part 2 gives a more detailed documentation of the interview areas in this area. The interviews had the character of relatively free conversation. The usual main questions were employed, but these main questions often had a very open character, the interviewer allowed and encouraged the respondents to converse in a natural manner. The group interviewed had a multifarious and usually long experience related to peace issues and peace education. The answers to the first question are rather brief probably because the interviewees are from a group of people who were chosen because of their interest in and knowledge about the topic of peace education. Also, they had already had the opportunity to make comments on the introductory questions of the interview; the answers, therefore, would be fairly predictable. The second question was formulated to elicit some examples of what the respondent thought could be done by the teacher in the classroom situation to contribute to peace education. Promotion strategies suggested include concerned individuals, flexible strategy, collaborative efforts at the local level, and teacher training. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 073

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ARE BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEACE EDUCATION – HOW?
A DISCUSSION OF STEPS AND MEASURES TO BE TAKEN

Åke Bjerstedt

"Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a 'peace education'? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?" These two questions were put to a number of people with special expertise and interest in peace education. The present report discusses and documents the answers given by fifty experts representing twenty-two countries.

Keywords: Aims of education, conflicts, global approach, non-violence, peace education, teaching methods, teacher-student interaction, values.

PART I

"Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a 'peace education'? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?" These two questions, linked together, were put to a number of people with special expertise and interest in peace education. The present report discusses and documents the answers given by fifty experts representing twenty-two countries. (More information about the fifty respondents is available in a separate report; Bjerstedt, 1993b.)

Part I of the report represents my attempts to summarize some major aspects of the answers, while Part II gives a more detailed documentation of the interview answers in this area.

The interviews had the character of relatively free conversations where the same main questions were employed, but where these main questions often had a very open character, and where the interviewer allowed and encouraged the respondents to talk about what he or she found natural to converse about. The group interviewed had a multifarious and usually long experience related to peace issues and peace education. With this type of interview structure and this experience background of the interviewees, it was natural that the answer material was quite variegated – this is true not least for the questions dealt with in the present report – but often personal and committed. Therefore, it is not very easy to summarize the content. To gain a more detailed insight, the reader has to study Part II. Only some aspects of the material have been taken up in Part I.

The "possibility" of peace education

As shown in the introductory lines above we deal with two questions: Is it possible for schools to contribute to some kind of peace education; and if so, what steps and measures should be carried out? It is characteristic for almost all answers that the first question in this pair is replied to extremely briefly, whereas the second one is dealt with in a fairly detailed manner. The reasons for the brief treatment of the first part are probably mainly two: on the one hand, we deal with a group of people who had been chosen because of their interest in and knowledge about the topic of peace education (the likelihood that members of such a group would answer "no" on the first part of the question complex is obviously small); on the other hand, the interviewees had already had the opportunity to make comments on the introductory questions of the interview that would make the answer fairly predictable. (The present question complex was the fifth in the total

interview.)

Thus, our experts do believe in the possibility of some form of peace education in school. The following brief quotations demonstrate how this positive view could be formulated:

"Yes, I do believe, of course, that schools can contribute to peace education. If not schools, who could do this?" (James Calleja.)

"I think it is possible and desirable. In fact, peace education should start in the schools if the homes do not take the initiative. As educators we should take it upon ourselves as our primary responsibility to educate for peace." (Virginia Floresca-Cawagas.)

"Do I think it's possible? Do I think the kingdom will come? Well, we are going to move toward it – we are marching on." (Kathleen Kanet.)

"Yes, it is possible and I think that if we are to survive as a nation and as a world, it is a necessity." (Linda Lantieri.)

"Yes, I think so – that is why I work in this field." (Betty Reardon.)

"Yes, it's not only possible, but I think it's crucial really." (Richard Yarwood.)

What can vary is the more specific meaning attached to the task (more about that below) and *how difficult* each person thinks that it may be to reach the objectives set up for this area. Now and then it is emphasized, especially by people who stress the broad task of influencing not only knowledge but also values and behavior, that schools are traditional organizations with considerable resistance to change and often even have some built-in "unpeaceful" characteristics.

"The strategy of changing or modifying schools into being more 'peaceful' influences is not easy. The basic structure of schooling has to be changed." (Robert Aspeslagh.)

"I don't believe that schools can do very much – in the most profound sense – but I think they should nevertheless discuss the issue. ... I am tempted to bring out a lot of 1970s and 1980s 'new' sociology of education which critiques the function of schools to reproduce a social order which is structurally unjust, and the fact that schools have done little to ... contribute to decreasing discrimination and violence. This does not excuse schools from trying. Firstly ... And secondly ... Finally, schools through the ways in which they teach young people, the structures and processes within the school can foster an appreciation of a non-violent, cooperative and more tolerant society. It is difficult for schools, which are dependent on the wider culture and subcultures, but this is not an excuse for inaction." (Robin Burns.)

"I remember that when I came to an IPRA conference in the late 70s and to the Peace Education Commission, there were several people who gave me the distinct impression that we could not talk about peace education in schools, that it would be a contradiction in terms, that by definition schools promoted structural violence. Schools are, however, quite a significant arena for debate, although it is difficult to introduce reforms. But obviously, I am not quite pessimistic." (David Hicks.)

"I think that it *is* possible. If it is not possible for schools to have an impact on peace education, I do not know what agency in society can be counted on to do the job. I recognize that it is very *difficult* for the schools to do it. It is very easy for us to take on more than we can do, to promise more than we can do and therefore disappoint. But I think for us to bow out on that account is unnecessary and probably foolish. Probably the schools are the best agency in society to undertake this task. In the first place we deal with the total population, and we do deal with them at a period in their lives when their ideas are to some extent malleable. We do not have more influence on them than their parents. We do not have more influence perhaps than their peers. But we do have some influence." (Douglas Ray.)

"Steps and measures to promote in general" vs. "steps and measures to carry out in the classroom"; some notes on promotion strategies

When formulating the second part of this question complex ('What are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?'), my original intention was to elicit some examples of what the respondent thought could be done by the teacher in the classroom situation to contribute to "peace education". Many of the interviewees also spontaneously interpreted and answered my question in this way. However, some of the respondents instead came to think and talk about steps and measures to promote peace education in general, to get it more widely accepted, to facilitate its introduction etc. Obviously it is also useful to get opinions on this, so I did not prevent my conversation partners from answering the question in the mode of "steps and measures to promote". However, when they had presented their opinions on that topic, I usually tried to shift the perspective, to elicit information also on "steps and measures to carry out", by follow-up questions focusing upon what could be done by the teacher in the classroom.

While most of the remainder of this part of the report will deal with

various ways of dealing with the peace education task in the classroom, in this particular section I will present some examples of what our respondents said about "steps and measures to promote in general" or *"promotion strategies"*.

Elise Boulding emphasized the importance of a small core of *concerned individuals* to *start new processes*, and that these individuals should have a *flexible strategy*, using any influence possibilities that may exist: "Work at the level where you have a chance to work. If your only access to the school system is one teacher you know, then work on her or him. If you have a chance to influence principals, work on that. If you have the chance to get a school system to adopt a peace studies curriculum, try that. There is a lot schools can do, but it takes some small core of concerned individuals to start the process." (Elise Boulding.)

When we deal with a decentralized school system, it would be important to *stimulate a collaborative effort at the local level*:

"In this country /USA/ it has to be a grass-root effort as a start. It has to come from the bottom up and has to include the parents and the local community. It has to include some of the school administrators in the local community and it has to include students." (Susan Alexander.)

"As I look back at our process here in New York City, probably one of our most important steps was to involve parents, community people, teachers, administrators, the Central Board, the Local School Board, experts in the field in a collaborative effort – that I think was the key." (Linda Lantieri.)

But obviously, some *background planning related to needs for change in the curriculum, division of labor etc.* has to be made at an early stage. Depending on the character of the school system and the degree of acceptance of the idea of peace education within this system, this planning work may be carried out at different levels of the system:

"As an initial step we should take stock of the curriculum, go over and reflect on each part of the curriculum: Are the agendas of the curriculum peaceful? Are they conducive to the creation of a peaceful mind? Administrators and faculty should look at the atmosphere and the existing structures in their schools: What kind of structures are apparent in the school? Are they affirming the dignity of the learner, of the individual, or are they constributing to oppressive systems and relationships?" (Virginia Floresca-Cawagas.)

"One way to work is at the curriculum level. The New South Wales Department of Education have had committees identifying all the areas and

existing subject courses which may deal with issues falling under the umbrella of peace education and have written handbooks and manuals for distribution in schools." (Max Lawson.)

The area most often emphasized in the discussions of promotion strategies was *teacher training*:

"And steps and measures to be taken would be to start educating teachers about the importance of this whole concept of peace education and education for justice and its linkage to character formation. That would take some time, but that would be the first steps." (Haim Gordon.)

"A ... step that was important was that we gave teachers 40 hours training, since we realized that we were embarking on some very new concepts and that the teachers themselves had not gotten this in their own education... In our program we also had each teacher visited ten times in the classroom by an expert who encouraged, demonstrated and inspired teachers..." (Linda Lantieri.)

"To me, the first thing that needs to be done is teacher training. The teachers need to be trained and supported in doing this work, and that includes several hours of training, ideally 20-30 hours of training for all the teachers who want to do this. I do believe it should be voluntary. Then consultants ... should go back into the schools and help teachers work out the problems that they might see with this. ... schools are always being told that all the problems of the society go back to them, and they are blamed for everything. Instead I think they need constant support in their task, the most important in the world." (Priscilla Prutzman.)

"Some of the concrete steps are to begin with the teachers themselves; they are the professionals; without teachers there would be no schools. The question to raise is how do we facilitate teachers to move into peace education? ... This calls for a lot of inservice work with teachers, where participatory workshops are needed rather than merely giving lectures. We need to engage teachers in dialogue and show them creative ways of doing peace education." (Toh Swee-Hin.)

Further discussion of the role of teacher training for peace education is presented elsewhere (Bjerstedt, 1994).

Before leaving the topic of "promotion strategies", let us finally listen to Herbert C. Kelman who *summarizes some of the relevant steps* and who warns us about the difficulties related to *resistance to innovation* that we have to be prepared for in work of this type:

"I don't have any very sparkling ideas about the steps, but I think it is a combination of things. One of them is development of programs. ... On the

whole, I have the impression that there is some very creative, good thinking being done. That is obviously step no. 1. ... The next step is really in part a political task: persuading school systems and the communities within which they operate to introduce these programs into the schools. Partly of course the task is one of teacher training, developing the skills to teach the curricula, because, no matter how good the curriculum prepared by some central team, its ultimate value depends on the personnel who apply it. But the other part is to persuade school systems to adopt the programs. These are simply the old problems of resistance to innovation in any kind of institution; by and large I would imagine that teachers and principals, like any other group of people, have at least mixed feelings about people coming in and trying to revolutionize their curricula."

Placement in the school's teaching-learning system: Six possible models

When focusing on the steps and measures to be taken in the everyday work of the schools, one of the natural questions is how the peace education task should be related to the school's traditional subject orientation and traditional way of handling teaching-learning generally. Elsewhere I have used the expression "placement in the didactic space" (cf. Bjerstedt, 1993a) for this kind of educational decision, sometimes made after deliberate discussions on various alternatives in our schools, but sometimes made with a fairly low degree of awareness following traditional routines.

In principle, peace education can be handled in a number of different ways in the schools' organizations and subject systems, for example:

(a) The task is referred to a special school subject already in existence, as a sub-task among several others.

(b) The task is referred to a specific, new course.

(c) The field is regarded as a common assignment for all, or several, school subjects and taken up at appropriate points, on a number of occasions, as the subjects run their course during the school year.

(d) The problems can be handled by means of activities outside the regular school day, as extracurricular activities arranged by especially interested teachers and students ("peace clubs" etc.).

(e) The problems can be handled outside the regular school subjects, but within the regular school day activities, e.g. in the form of special theme days, perhaps involving the collaboration of several teachers with different specialities and invited guest speakers.

(f) The field is viewed primarily as aiming at education for peace values and for democratic participation in non-violent interaction with others, whereby the question of attachment to a specific school subject or course moves into the background.

To begin with, it can generally be said that discussions in current peace education literature as well as in the interviews reported on here contain arguments associated with a variety of models, and that the models are not usually regarded as mutually exclusive. Different combinations are not only possible, but often deemed desirable. Let us look at some of the views represented.

One or several subjects?

On the level of higher education (universities) the trend has been for peace issues to be treated as a special subject with such international designations as "Peace Studies" or "World Order Studies". It is of course perfectly conceivable to introduce a corresponding special course in school. What usually comes to mind, in that case, is a free elective among the older students (senior high school, upper secondary school).

Making the field into a special school subject can have the advantage that a certain slot on the time table will be guaranteed for issues related to peace and war. It also increases the interest among publishers to produce teaching materials and teacher's manuals in this field.

Organizing a special course in this way, means, however, that a relatively small group of students will be reached. An alternative could then be to give a special school subject, already in existence, the task of covering peace-related issues as one area among others. In this way, it will not be an optional course, and it could cover a broader age range. A traditional school subject area often referred to in such discussions is "social studies" (including various alternative labels).

My own opinion, however, is that neither of these two options (which both limit peace education to a specific subject) is a particularly good solution. There is a risk of further fragmentation of an already incoherent processing of knowledge in our schools. Furthermore, it seems quite natural, in many respects, to address peace issues in the framework of a number of the school's traditional subjects. Moreover, and above all, the target area for peace-oriented teaching is such that it is not only, or even primarily, a matter of an easily delimited field of knowledge. It is, indeed, also a matter of ways of thinking, of values, and of the ability to act. In other words, we deal with issues concerning long-term student development

which do not necessarily lend themselves naturally to encapsulation within the narrow boundaries of a specialized subject.

Thus, in the interviews we find several clear recommendations of a several-subjects approach to peace education. But it also happens that attention is directed to the difficulties that may arise in connection with a several-subject approach: When many people share the responsibility, there is a risk that the assignment will not receive sufficient attention or that students do not get a coherent view of basic issues. To avoid this risk, there is an obvious need for cooperative planning between teachers, especially at those school levels where a class of students may have many teachers.

A few quotations from the interviews will illustrate some of the reactions to the issues touched upon here:

"As far as the content of peace education is concerned, of course there have been discussions about whether it should be made into a separate subject, or integrated into different subjects. Personally, I think it should be included in many subjects, and I am rather worried about simply categorizing peace education as a separate subject which may be elected only by a few students in the upper grades. – I was once a member of a departmental group (appointed by the Council for the Upper Secondary School under a Social Democratic government) that addressed itself to these questions in Norway. We recommended both options, *both* integration in different school subjects *and* creating a special curricular option for the upper grades, and we drew up a curriculum for such a subject. Our proposal was torpedoed by a new Conservative regime, but it reappeared later in a modified form, and the pupils now have the opportunity to elect a special curricular option: 'Peace and Security'." (Birgit Brock-Utne.)

"I do not believe that we should have a new subject called Peace Studies. I think it must be a perspective across the curriculum and for this you need educators to help teachers to integrate peace issues, peace-related discussions and peace activities within the normal curricula. The teachers need new knowledge in some subjects – on issues in physical science, for example. But especially, they need encouragement to try new methods and training in handling controversial issues in the classroom and in using working methods that stress cooperation rather than individual competition and assessment. Learning democratic decision-making is to me part of peace education and this needs to be integrated in the school. It's very hard to have three lessons a week with this perspective and the rest of the school completely out of touch with this approach." (Robin Burns.)

"There is ... a subject in the higher school certificate (or the matricula-

tion to university certificate), called general studies, which ... in fact many students do take. This course deals totally with contemporary issues and many of the concerns of peace education come up... It is the official policy not to have a special subject called peace education and indeed most educators in Australia would agree with this; separate courses on peace education or peace studies being reserved for teachers colleges and universities. Nevertheless, students in the general studies might be quite good at answering questions dealing with peace studies themes." (Max Lawson.)

"Pragmatically, we try to fit it /peace education/ in where we can, really, and the easiest way to do it is often within a set course. However, ideally the methods of peace education are as important as the content, and the methods of peace education in my opinion should be integrated in all sorts of subjects. But in terms of specific topics, a specific course has the advantage of demonstrating the holistic nature of the issues, how they interrelate. But this does not mean that you should not take up relevant questions in other subjects, for example, a debate on the moral implications of nuclear power in physics. ... We have various examination boards covering regions, and there do exist within some of these examination boards, peace study components in courses. I don't know how many they are, but it's really only a handful. ... They would be optional courses." (Richard Yarwood.)

Thematic short-term input and special extra-curricular activities

Some of our interviewees discuss the possibilities of using activities outside the ordinary classroom routines for peace-related activities. It could be "special days" devoted to peace-related themes, or it could be extra-curricular activities (outside the regular school day, but stimulated by teachers).

Stig Lindholm says: "It is often said that peace education should not be a separate subject, and I agree. But I think that at the stage where we are just now, we must come up with some so-called publicity stunts, that is we must resort to specific measures that catch people's attention. I think there should be special days that focus on the theme of peace, illustrating it and making it visible. Then I wish that peace and development could be discussed in all the subjects... – ... of course, we are always short of time at school; there are so many things that compete for a place in the curriculum. So what the schools can do, I suppose, is to give the students a stimulating push, and then, hopefully, they will join groups that work with these issues: peace movements, political parties ..., groups within various professions working

for peace, Amnesty, the Red Cross etc. I think the main part of the work has to take place outside school, but the students' interest could be aroused at school so that they got more involved."

Robert Muller mentions the special days proclaimed by the UN as one starting-point: "The UN has proclaimed many international days. One simple step in the schools would be to say to the children: Today is the United National Human Rights day (10 December). What do you think about human rights? How do you define human rights? What do you think are *your* human rights? What could the world do? What can the individual do to promote human hights? ... On World Food Day (16 October) ask children not to eat for a day and to make a little donation to UNICEF. Thus children will know what it means to be hungry."

When talking to active teachers, descriptions of "special activities" like theme days, theme weeks or peace cabarets are often mentioned as examples of how to deal with peace education in schools. Such ventures can undoubtedly be valuable as attention-getting stimuli. In addition, they often facilitate the collaboration among teachers of different subjects that is so important in this connection. It is also easier to make good use of special "guest experts" and to coordinate the more classroom-oriented elements with activities of a different kind. Actually, in some countries short-term inputs of this kind ("special event approach", in the form of United Nations Day programs and the like) seem to be one of the most usual ways of addressing peace issues in schools at present. But if this were to become the *only* contribution of the school to the peace education field, the situation would be unsatisfactory. It would be more reasonable to regard such thematic short-term efforts as *either* an attention-getting starting point for a period of working with these issues in various school subjects, *or* as a wrap-up, arranged by the students themselves, with various kinds of presentations for other people, either in or outside of school, after a period of classroom study, of problems in the field of war and peace.

"The peaceable classroom" and "implicit peace education"

While a number of peace researchers tend to emphasize the transmission of basic knowledge on peace and war, including various results from peace research, for a number of educators it is more usual to stress the gradual inculcation of attitudes, values and readiness to act, which implies preparedness to function peacefully and seek non-violent solutions to problems in different situations. When this latter alternative is emphasized, the implication is to begin with quite young children, and the school's subject

system moves into the background. Several of our respondents indicated views of this kind. Some illustrations follow:

"Peace education is primarily a process, not a content. Of course it's content also, because you have to have a content to which you apply the process. But ... you can teach everything – mathematics, physics, music etc. – using the process of peace education, where you work with collaborative and cooperative methods, treat people as if they have dignity, employ non-authoritarian techniques and techniques in the classroom that empower the students to have a voice and an opinion. They should be empowered to have an opinion on things that really matter... I think part of the process of peace education involves being more interested in questions than in answers, and so you could use inquiry techniques no matter what you teach... – The teacher doesn't have to have a pre-set idea of what the issues are that students must be interested in. He or she shouldn't be forcing the issues down the student's throat..." (Susan Alexander.)

"I think one of the first things that must be done in the school is to develop more cooperative, democratic ways of working within the school. There is something contradictory about a school that might teach peace topics in the classroom and yet operate in authoritarian and non-democratic ways." (James Collinge.)

"In recent years, it has ... been increasingly recognized that our schools have to change in basic ways if we are to educate the children so that they are prepared to live in a peaceful world. In my view, there are four key components in the steps and measures needed: cooperative learning, conflict resolution training, the constructive use of controversy in teaching subject-matters, and the creation of dispute resolution centers in schools." (Morton Deutsch. Morton Deutsch, who has a long-time research background in this area, gives a fairly detailed summary of what the basic elements of these processes are, in his interview replies, so the interested reader is recommended to read the full answer in Part II.)

"Basic to me is that peace education should be good education, where good communication, all sorts of exercises with listening techniques (creative listening) are included... – Multicultural education with emphasis on cooperation and understanding the other's point of view (using role play and drama as techniques) would also be important. The idea is to put yourself into the other's shoes, to be able to understand him or her. – Direct approaches to conflict solving, I think, can begin very early and go on through the years, not attemptning to *give* the children the solutions but to train them to work out their own solutions, to sort out the problems them-

selves. This is a process of real democracy." (Mildred Masheder.)

"Peace education has to do with personal involvement, and I think that in my opinion peace education starts with the development of some basic values, peace values. ... – A school philosophy must be shaped by peace values. You cannot talk to children in a meaningful way about social justice if the school system is not a social-justice system. And you cannot talk effectively with children about non-violence, if the school system itself is violent. I think these attitudes and skills should be there before schools introduce children systematically to the political problems of the world." (Lennart Vriens.)

As mentioned elsewhere, a distinction is sometimes made between explicit and implicit peace education. Explicit peace education usually means direct information about, and discussions of, issues related to war and peace. Implicit peace education, on the other hand, means such nurturing to acquire peaceful values and behavior as may be found in experiencing, and being a member of, an open, gentle school environment where emphasis is laid on dialogue (a cooperation-oriented school without authoritarian features). In their approach, advocates of implicit peace education often resemble "reform pedagogues" or "progressive pedagogues" in general.

There is much to suggest that peace-oriented education should work along *both* of these avenues: with early training in attitudes, values and ability to take action in unison with the goal of preparedness for peace ("implicit peace education"), and with a gradual development of knowledge, concepts and proficiencies related to current problems of war and peace ("explicit peace education").

Implicit peace education cannot be fully treated within the limits of a special peace education subject or course, whereas this might be possible for the explicit approach. At present, however, in many school situations it appears plausible to let peace education be an assignment for the normal teaching in all or most subjects at school (which does not, of course, prevent normal teaching from being supplemented with special thematic contributions, and possibly being supported by extra-curricular activities). Such an arrangement, however, requires some planning at the local level, so that the efforts of the various school subjects complement each other adequately (avoiding both duplications and omissions).

Further comments on goals and contents: Cognitive aspects – value perspectives – readiness for action

It is obvious that our group of experts think about a very broad and quite complex goal area when they discuss what can and should be done in the classroom in peace education. It is not only natural to deal with knowledge (even though knowledge is seen as important). It is also essential to take up value perspectives (ethics, ideals), and it may be very relevant to stimulate various kinds of readiness for action – especially as a counterbalance to those tendencies to experience hopelessness and inability to influence things that have often been seen in studies of conceptions of the future among children and young people in various countries in recent decades.

A series of knowledge domains exist where there are useful facts to deal with in peace education. Peace research can give information that may help to undermine conceptions that in general debates and propaganda sometimes are taken for granted as "self-evident facts". But it is also important to create the ability and the habit among school students to *openly discuss* also *controversial issues with rational arguments*. Furthermore, *a critical search for alternatives* is essential, and then we need to train young people both to examine critically historical and present developments and to be able to create alternative visions. Some examples of views and arguments related to cognitive aspects follow:

"I think it is ... important for young people to be challenged to think about – I don't want to say 'be taught about', but be challenged to think about – critically the major peace issues. To me, an education that does not challenge people to think about the crucial questions of war, peace, defence, nuclear question and related questions of justice, of the environment, is a severely deficient education. I think it is necessary for schools to develop various sorts of measures to do this, because it seems to me that – certainly in New Zealand – a lot of young people would say that parents do not talk with us about these things; we want to talk with adults, we want to have the opportunity to study these sorts of issues. The school is the obvious place to do so." (James Collinge.)

"In the cognitive domain I also think it's important to use peace education to debate controversial issues, to help people learn how to develop rational arguments and defend their positions. As one of the methods of peace education, take a position on the INF treaty or some war or various other conflict situations in the world, and create a class where students can take different positions, arguing for the correctness of their positions. Such

activities introduce students to the complexity of foreign policy debates. The purpose of those activities is to introduce students to alternatives, show them there *are* alternatives to violence ... I think that schools can be an important place to introduce those kinds of alternatives." (Ian M. Harris.)

There exists among many teachers some uneasiness or resistance against taking up *value perspectives* related to peace and war issues. To cut away value perspectives in a peace-oriented teaching would be absurd, however. *How* to deal with values may be discussed, on the other hand. It is often also natural for many persons interested in peace education to stress the importance of creating a *readiness to act* among students and to stimulate various kinds of acts. As indicated above, one basic objective is to create hope (seeing possibilities) and a wish among the students to take part in the work of the future. If this general goal can be fairly widely accepted among our experts, there might be more doubts about more direct training to act in this area. Problems related to this topic are mentioned: For example, how can we distinguish between adequate stimulation and indoctrinating influences; or between peace-relevant acts, attitude-relevant symbolic acts and irrelevant pseudo activities?

Some illustrations of the views expressed by our respondents in the area of value perspectives and action follow:

"There is ... the broader political problem relating to the question of what is proper and improper for schools to do. I know that the whole issue of education about nuclear war has been a matter of great controversy, and I think the answers are not very simple. I don't think that one can introduce a curriculum dealing with questions of war and peace that is value free. I just don't see how it can be done. I can only counter any criticism by saying that nothing we introduce in the schools related to social science or history, or to politics or civics, is value free. ... We don't want the schools to engage in indoctrination, although they always have been and the question may be only: on whose behalf do they indoctrinate and on behalf of what ideology? There are those who accuse the people who want to introduce programs on peace education of politicizing the schools. But schools have been politicized all along... I think one has – at the level of the individual community – to be sensitive to these concerns, but one has to be creatively sensitive. In other words, we should neither say: 'We won't do anything that might get somebody upset'; nor should we say: 'Well, we'll do whatever we think is right and let's not worry about people getting upset'. It's the same set of problems, broadly speaking, as those involved in sex education. I think that this is a set of issues that should be addressed at the

local level, but I also think that somebody needs to do some broad thinking about it." (Herbert C. Kelman.)

"One difficulty that we ran into in teaching about the developing countries was that the teacher should be objective and, at the same time, create a positive attitude towards aid to developing countries and an understanding of the predicament of the poor countries. I suppose you encounter the same problem in working with questions of peace. I think it is important that the person whom the students meet is really committed, and I would like people representing various perspectives to be invited (the national defense, peace movements, Amnesty, the Red Cross, for example), so that committed people representing different positions might be given a chance to have their say." (Stig Lindholm.)

"Do not let the children despair about the world situation. Tell them that it is in their hands, through their participation, through their volition that things will change. If you let them drift and say that the whole situation is hopeless because of governments, because of institutions, because of the UN or things of this sort, you are not helping children. You have to tell them that this is a matter they have in their own hands, that it is going to be their world and that peace is the great challenge they will have to solve in the third millennium. Make them feel proud, responsible and participative. Tell them that they will be the peacemakers of tomorrow, the first peace generation ever." (Robert Muller.)

"... the idea that we are going to promote a particular kind of society would be regarded by many educators as propaganda, and propaganda is a very bad word. On the other hand, I think propaganda is not necessarily different in kind from advertising in any other sense. ... We certainly do advertise to try to promote health, more exercise ... and that sort of thing. More fundamental than any of these kinds of things is to try to live a life which will enable us as a human species to survive on this planet. If that is not an important matter to use propaganda for – I don't know what is. – ... I think one of the most important things is to avoid preaching, talking in abstractions. We have to get some kinds of steps that kids can become aware of and can take action in – where they see the difference and realize that it is worthwhile to try to do this sort of thing. Thus, for example, we can help them to realize that their society is racist or sexist, and that they have a personal responsibility in transforming this. ... – The way in which this seems most possible to me, is to have the children participate in the government of their school to some extent." (Douglas Ray.)

"I'm not sure whether peace education should lead children into action.

Maybe this can be a consequence, but I think then it must be an action of the children themselves – I think peace education must not stress children into actions approved by adults. You should be careful here, because there's a kind of gray zone between what's peace education and what's indoctrination. We are responsible for the children, and we must take a careful position: we must teach them to think about the problems, we must invite them to come to a standpoint of their own, but we must not be too specific in our own influence." (Lennart Vriens.)

Some final notes on methods and materials

Since the goal area is very broad, and since we deal with a field that can be handled at different ages and in different subjects, the *teaching methods* used will also be quite diverse. The interviewees got specific questions about the adjustment of the teaching task to various age levels and school subjects (and their views in these respects have been dealt with elsewhere; cf. Bjerstedt, 1993a, 1993c).

A very basic recommendation related to methods is to start from the conceptions, reactions and questions of the students themselves. This is of course a good educational principle in all teaching-learning work, but it is certainly very important – and nevertheless often overlooked – when we deal with an area that for many is emotionally loaded or controversial. – Contacts with the world outside the classroom will be essential in many respects: both in order to get a good view of the spectrum of views that exist about peace/war issues, for example via invited guests; and in order to start an action-oriented interplay with other groups, for instance via letter-writing to young people in other countries or contacts with local groups with international ambitions and programs. – But it is also important, of course, to give the students possibilities for relevant experiences and empathy training within the classroom, via films, reading of fiction, biographies of "peace workers", songs, role plays, etc. – A few illustrations follow:

"I would have the teacher get involved in encounters. If it is a Jewish teacher with Jewish students, they would meet with Arabs to get to know each other under non-threatening circumstances – and vice versa. That would be one of the easier ways to begin. Then the task would be to try to generalize from that experience to other experiences, dealing with world-wide threats and social justice in the global society." (Haim Gordon.)

"... that is probably the most problematic thing of all, that the very thing that I would ideally have liked to happen to peace education, namely that

the content was developed from the pupils' own interests, ideals and hopes, seems to be hard to implement at school. There seems to be a built-in idea that if you are to teach somebody something, the content must be determined in advance. This kind of prescribed instruction, which Freire calls 'bank instruction', is so deeply ingrained in everyone who works at school that they are unused to conducting a dialogue that attempts to include the pupils' own subjective reactions towards the world. – ... It's important to make the pupils more active and to take part when the pre-conditions for the development of the content are laid down." (Magnus Haavelsrud.)

"One of the points, we always raise with teachers in our workshops is the need to listen to their learners instead of just imposing ideas on them. We should always start from the ideas and feelings of our students, and then the teacher's role is to facilitate the broadening and deepening of the student's understanding. The teacher could later also question and challenge the students, suggesting ideas that they may not have considered before in order to better understand the wider realities around them. This step-by-step process is critical in my view for effective peace education in classrooms." (Toh Swee-Hin.)

The lack of *teaching materials and teacher's manuals* in the area of peace education has been a problem, and although the situation today is better than before, it is still felt as a handicap and hence something worth special efforts in the immediate future. Let us listen to some views related to this need:

"You have a group of reactionary or conservative teachers. They will never change or accept this kind of education. But then, in the middle, I think there is a big group – they are at least a very big potential – and they are good teachers. They are willing to do a lot, but they do not have an idea how to do it, because they never learned to be creative, to think for themselves. They follow their textbooks and so on, and these teachers benefit greatly from adequate materials." (Robert Aspeslagh.)

"I think, as appears from my previous answer, that it is possible for schools to contribute to peace education. In the same answer I referred to some conditions. Those conditions are: a) Availability of teaching materials, which have been developed in cooperation with teachers/schools, and which are attuned to distinct age groups, existing subjects and curricula, and to the timetable. b) Availability of teachers' manuals, with instructions about the use of those materials. c) Availability of a curriculum, based on experiences gained in school practice. d) Supply of courses for teacher training... e) Recognition of, or at least consent to, peace education projects from edu-

cational authorities." (Henk B. Gerritsma.)

To carry out peace education programs in schools is a complex and sometimes difficult endeavour, due among other things to its character of innovation. Sometimes the complexity involved may lead to frustrations and a feeling that you get lost in problematic details. Then it may be useful to keep the *basic vision* in view:

"A major aim is to make this world better; and I think that this aim of making the world a better place, with equality, justice and a healthy environment, is to be kept in mind in our efforts to deal with various minor problems and in our efforts to acquire meaningful knowledge. A major step in peace education is to *start thinking about the world as we want it to be.*" (Riitta Wahlström.)

PART II

Susan Alexander (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

I think it's possible. In this country it has to be a grass-root effort as a start. It has to come from the bottom up and has to include the parents and the local community. It has to include some of the school administrators in the local community and it has to include students.

ÅB: If you think of the steps and measures as things to be done in the classroom, what would be some of the things that the teacher might do in order to reach the goals of peace education?

SA: There are different ways of looking at that. Peace education is primarily a process, not a content. Of course it's content also, because you have to have a content to which you apply the process. But if you think of peace education as a process, then you can teach everything – mathematics, physics, music etc. – using the process of peace education, where you work with collaborative and cooperative methods, treat people as if they have dignity, employ non-authoritarian techniques and techniques in the classroom that empower the students to have a voice and an opinion. They should be empowered to have an opinion on things that really matter, not just on the Mickey-Mouse things (like deciding on what to put up on the bulletin board), but really having a say, for example on the kind of exams that you might give in mathematics. I think part of the process of peace education involves being more interested in questions than in answers, and so you could use inquiry techniques no matter what you teach: biology, French etc.

I would also like to think of social responsibility education as a process. The teacher doesn't have to have a pre-set idea of what the issues are that students must be interested in. He or she shouldn't be forcing the issues down the student's throat, but rather say: These are the social issues in the world today – these are the urgent ones; it's important that you take responsibility for something. You need to take responsibility after you have informed yourself, you should figure out what you think and what you believe and then take a stand. This is possible to do in any subject and in any classroom, from the first grade all the way to graduate school.

ÅB: Would you say that your organization, ESR, has this process emphasis,

or is this more your personal view?
SA: I think the major difference between ESR and many of the other groups in the peace education area is that we emphasize it as a process more than others do.

Robert Aspeslagh (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The strategy of changing or modifying schools into being more "peaceful" influences is not easy. The basic structure of schooling has to be changed. You have to develop materials, you have to develop methods. It may be useful to work with core schools very intensively for a couple of years, with the whole team of school personnel, and you have to have inservice training.
ÅB: You said you have to develop methods. What kind of methods do you have in mind?
RA: When you look at the tradition in the Netherlands, it's working with projects, open projects – not closed ones.
ÅB: How would you define an open project?
RA: Projects which are set up and decided upon in mutual agreement between teachers and pupils are open projects. It is a problem that many people working with peace education or peace work believe in projects as *The* Way. I see projects as *one* way. I also think that you can do a lot with a combination of arts and disciplines. I worked with what we called Language and Image; that is, we try to find a connection between what is written or said and the expression through arts.

Horizontal relations are important too, that is, working with no dominant or conspicuous teacher. I had no teacher's desk. We developed the curriculum and program of our school together with the pupils. I had the right as a teacher to say: I think this is important for you to know. But they also had the right to say: We like that and that and that. So there was a collaborative effort which came out of the discussions we had.
ÅB: You also said that materials development would be important. What kind of materials do you have in mind?
RA: I said it is important because there are lots of teachers whom I call indifferent. You have a group of reactionary or conservative teachers. They will never change or accept this kind of education. But then, in the middle, I think there is a big group – they are at least a very big potential – and

they are good teachers. They are willing to do a lot, but they do not have an idea how to do it, because they never learned to be creative, to think for themselves. They follow their textbooks and so on, and these teachers benefit greatly from adequate materials.
ÅB: Such materials – do they exist today in your country, do you think?
RA: Yes. There are so many materials that the problem is to know what to choose.

Anima Bose (New Delhi, India)

Yes. First of all, children should *learn* what peace means, what peace is, what peace stands for. In informal education, which begins at home, where you have the first socialization, parents have their duty to pay attention that the values of peace and the ways of peace and nonviolence are inculcated in their children. In the formal school education, every student must have an opportunity for peace education. We have to let teachers and parents know why peace education is necessary. They do need to be oriented toward this particular area. It's a new word; many people don't understand why it's so vital. We also have to realize that violence can be of various types – overt, covert, subtle, passive – and we have to learn to perceive them. Peace as "no war" is too simplistic an idea. If there is no war in a country and there are injustice, poverty, economic discrimination, inequity, can we say that this country has peace?
ÅB: Do you think that peace education should be a special school subject or should it be included in the different school subjects?
AB: Both are possible. But I think it should be a specific subject where we deal with, for instance: "What is peace", or "The faces of violence", then give examples. The ways of conflict resolution are important. The students should also make observations about violence in their own community: "Do you have slum areas, and do you have violence in these slum areas?" "Do you see violence between parents in your house?" "Do you see violence in the administration of your school?" "Do you see violence in the shops and the commercial area?" "Do you see violence in the marriage customs?"
ÅB: When you talk about a specific course, do you think there is a specific age for that?
AB: I think, yes. In the first place, materials are needed for age 13 or 14 to the end of the school years. Then, there should be specific courses at the

university level. But peace education issues should also be dealt with by the primary school teachers at the children's level.

I myself have gone to pre-kindergarten groups, and had discussions with the boys and girls as to how they would react when some children want to fight. These very elementary things can also be seen as means of peace education. There can be several examples. The situations could be simulated.

For all these tasks, teacher training is utterly important. The teacher is the most important, the most responsible person in any peace education course at any level. Very importantly, the teacher must believe in peace and nonviolence. Or else, he or she should not undertake to teach peace education courses, peace-studies courses.

Elise Boulding (Boulder, Colorado, USA)

An individual teacher who cares can do a lot in her classroom. If a system will adopt a special peace studies curriculum for the system, it's tremendous. My answer is always: Work at the level where you have the chance to work. If your only access to the school system is one teacher you know, then work on her or him. If you have a chance to influence principals, work on that. If you have the chance to get a school system to adopt a peace studies curriculum, try that. There is a lot schools can do, but it takes some small core of concerned individuals to start the process.

ÅB: You now talk about general steps and measures to get peace education going. If you think about the classroom level, what could the individual teacher do?

EB: There are parallels between peace education and feminism or working against racism. There is a way of teaching any subject that is respectful of individuals and their creative potential that has implications for peace. The same is true for the way one treats women or members of other races. It is a way to teach and one should be sensitive to that. That is one thing. Another is, of course, a re-casting of conventional textbooks to point out the potentials for conflict and war or the potentials for peace-making. These subjects are not adequately treated in textbooks. A teacher should also set standards for behavior in the classroom; it is important how a teacher treats students and how she or he encourages them to handle their conflicts. Yes, there are many things that can be done right in the classroom. In addition, teachers' relations with the parents of the children are essential. How much

trouble they take to make that contact differs widely.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Oslo, Norway)

Yes, clearly I think it is possible. But there is an enormous difference between what you can and should do on lower and higher grade levels. In the lowers grades, the main thrust should be on what we have called "fostering". Thus, one uses the classroom more as a laboratory, in which one may take various kinds of day-to-day conflicts as one's starting point and works on the social atmosphere in the class. Teachers very often notice that some conflict is going on; it may be a matter of mobbing, or of more particular conflicts. It is important to tackle it, analyze it and discuss it. What happened, really? What caused it? What could one have done differently? I think it is very important to learn non-violence, and it is relatively hard to learn. Non-violence craves great imagination, among other things, because it requires finding new solutions. I think that this is a major assignment for the school, since there are not many other places where people have the chance to learn to solve conflicts non-violently.

After that, one can gradually go further, and show the similarities between those conflicts that exist in the school environment and those on the national and international level, and try to analyze such conflicts as well. It is also important to call attention to the fact that a great many national and international conflicts are, in fact, solved without recourse to violence. The problem is that such cases do not receive much attention, either by the media or by researchers.

As far as the content of peace education is concerned, of course there have been discussions about whether it should be made into a separate subject, or integrated into different subjects. Personally, I think that it should be included in many subjects, and I am rather worried about simply categorizing peace education as a separate subject which may be elected only by a few students in the upper grades.

I was once a member of a departmental group (appointed by the Council for the Upper Secondary School under a Social Democratic government) that addressed itself to these questions in Norway. We recommended both options, *both* integration in different school subjects *and* creating a special curricular option for the upper grades, and we drew up a curriculum for such a subject. Our proposal was torpedoed by a new Conservative regime,

but it reappeared later in a modified form, and the pupils now have the opportunity to elect a special curricular option: "Peace and Security".
ÅB: What has your experience in Norway been with this option?
BB: I can't really answer that, because I have had no personal contacts, nor have I done any studies of it. In any case, only a limited number of our pupils have the opportunity to choose this particular option.

Robin Burns (Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia)

I don't believe that schools can do very much – in the most profound sense – but I think they should nevertheless discuss the issue. They need to reflect on types of knowledge that they select for transmission. History is a good example where war knowledge and values rather than peace values can very easily become the dominant ones. I am tempted to bring out a lot of 1970s and 1980s 'new' sociology of education which critiques the function of schools to reproduce a social order which is structurally unjust, and the fact that schools have done little to change the situation of the poor, or to contribute to decreasing discrimination and violence.

This does not excuse schools from trying. Firstly, I am increasingly convinced that schools can make a positive contribution to a child's self-esteem and attitudes they hold towards others: the sort of developmental work, materials and topics chosen especially in the primary school can contribute to attitudes and skills which are 'peace-friendly'. And secondly, through the choice of content and the careful selection of texts and other materials, schools can transmit knowledge, and do so in particular ways which enable students to develop critical awareness of peace issues and possibilities. Finally, schools through the ways in which they teach young people, the structures and processes within the school can foster an appreciation of a non-violent, co-operative and more tolerant society. It is difficult for schools, which are dependent on the wider culture and subcultures, but this is not an excuse for inaction.
ÅB: When you say you would like the schools to try could you give some illustrations of what you have in mind?
RB: Firstly I do not believe that we should have a new subject called Peace Studies. I think it must be a perspective across the curriculum and for this you need educators to help teachers to integrate peace issues, peace-related discussions and peace activities within the normal curricula. The teachers

need new knowledge in some subjects – on issues in physical science, for example. But especially, they need encouragement to try new methods and training in handling controversial issues in the classroom and in using working methods that stress cooperation rather than individual competition and assessment. Learning democratic decision-making is to me part of peace education and this needs to be integrated in the school. It's very hard to have three lessons a week with this perspective and the rest of the school completely out of touch with this approach.

ÅB: Would there be some specific kind of teaching materials that you think would have to be developed?

RB: Yes, although teachers have been fairly good at finding and developing resources. We are generally working within a school based curriculum development framework in Australia, so that each school and in many instances each teacher selects their own materials, and there has been some resistance to centrally-delivered curriculum. There have also been conservative accusations of dangerous bias in peace education. Good curriculum guidelines and annotated bibliographies and resource guides can only be encouraged. In-servicing of teachers to work with the materials would also be important, yet the number of days teachers are allowed to undertake such activities is being reduced, while demands on them to master new areas and skills increase.

ÅB: Is there some specific Australian publication dealing with these things – a book on peace education in general – that you could recommend?

RB: I am trying to write one. No there is not.

James Calleja (Valletta, Malta)

Yes, I do believe, of course, that schools can contribute to peace education. If not schools, who could do this? I think it is the task of schools, both private and public, to incorporate peace education in the syllabus.

ÅB: What is the situation in Malta with respect to private and public schools?

JC: One third of our school population goes to private schools, two thirds to government schools. We have to make sure that the values of peace education are inculcated in both. So far private school education has been more inclined to include peace education than government schools. Some experiments have already been undertaken in private schools, and we are very

much satisfied by their reception, and we want to make use of this interest in peace education of private schools to encourage government schools to take up the idea as well. With regards to steps and measures, as I mentioned before, we started with student teachers. That does not mean that other initiatives have not been undertaken, such as ad hoc lectures or small study circles, but basically we want our student teachers to help in drafting the programs to be implemented in schools later on. This is our strategy.

ÅB: When you think of teachers' steps and measures right in the classroom, what is the first thing you come to think of?

JC: We favour an integrated approach. We have invited some of the teachers to give us their ideas, with respect to particular school subjects, about how they themselves would incorporate the values of peace within their subject, and we have had some encouraging results there. Since our syllabi in primary school education do give you flexibility, primary school teachers have also experimented with this kind of approach and have given us feedback on what they think about it. In the area of teaching practice, the student teachers try out some approaches and they report back to us.

Before we started with the projects and the national seminar, we had several meetings with higher authorities on this. In fact, if you have a look at the report of the national seminar, you would see that, for example, the President of Malta opened the seminar. It was a symbolic gesture, but we wanted to make sure that our authorities were au courant with what we were doing, that we had their moral support. It was an example of confidence building between the grass-root levels and the top-levels, and it *did* make a significant difference. We were of course also very honored and pleased to have the Minister of Education of Malta Dr. Ugo Mifsud Bonnici address the seminar twice.

Terry Carson (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

The answer is of course: Yes. And I think that in the younger grades they can primarily do two things: One is to practice non-violent conflict resolution. It's very important for schools to *model* non-violent conflict resolution. I think at the primary level they can deal with some forms of international understanding in the sense of understanding other people, particularly understanding children in different countries and understanding differences even among children in the own classroom. You can introduce

some environmental care at that level too.

At the upper elementary level, which in Canada is ages 9 to 11, I think you can continue the kind of things which you are doing in the junior grades, but also children of that age are very interested in the rest of the world. They are real collectors of facts. I think we should capitalize on that. At the same time I think that at that age, we can start to introduce a little critical analysis of the media and start to have children think about the kinds of messages they get in their own culture about enemies and about images they get about the rest of the world. In peace education we want to particularly focus on images of violence.

At the secondary school level, I think we can begin to work with things like disarmament education and development education in a more formal way. I wouldn't think of teaching disarmament education until the age of 15 or 16. At the age of 12 to 14 I think they have a great capacity for interest and understanding questions of justice. They can also deal with environmental education at that age, both from the point of view of knowledge and from the point of view of action. At that age the students are fairly autonomous – they can go out and carry out small projects "on the road". The students at the upper secondary school tend not to be as active in terms of practical projects. They are more likely to sit back and intellectualize. I don't think we should let them remain that way, but I think we have to recognize that difference anyway. Dialogue with students in other countries is important at all ages. Both exchanges of letters and personal exchanges should be tried.

James Collinge (Wellington, New Zealand)

Yes, I think it is possible, and I think one of the first things that must be done in the school is to develop more cooperative, democratic ways of working within the school. There is something contradictory about a school that might teach peace topics in the classroom and yet operate in authoritarian and non-democratic ways. There is a parallel in Kohlberg's work on moral education; he said that it is a waste of time trying to teach moral education in a school that does not operate in a moral way when trying to solve moral problems. With peace education, the school should develop more democratic structures, more cooperation, more emphasis on conflict resolution rather than trying to solve conflict by discipline and authori-

tarian methods. I think that it is important and I am particularly interested in the upper levels of the school here.

I think it is also important for young people to be challenged to think about – I don't want to say "be taught about", but be challenged to think about – critically the major peace issues. To me, an education that does not challenge people to think about the crucial questions of war, peace, defence, nuclear question and related questions of justice, of the environment, is a severely deficient education. I think it is necessary for schools to develop various sorts of measures to do this, because it seems to me that – certainly in New Zealand – a lot of young people would say that parents do not talk with us about these things; we want to talk with adults, we want to have the opportunity to study these sorts of issues. The school is the obvious place to do so.

ÅB: If we talk about this area in terms of the goals that peace education should strive for, they would obviously include knowledge and some thinking about peace issues. Would you also include certain kinds of attitudes or values or behavior tendencies?

JC: Yes, I would. I think it is important to strive towards having an attitude that it is important to be able to cooperate. I have a strong feeling that unless our species learns to cooperate, we will not survive. I think it is an important attitude to learn to solve our conflicts between each other in non-violent ways. I think that peace education must stimulate positive attitudes towards the environment and towards global questions. I think it is very important that we develop knowledge and understanding of the interrelatedness of human beings with each other and human beings with the environment and also I want to make a very strong connection between peace education and positive attitudes towards justice or concern for justice and concern for the elimination of racism. As we have seen in a number of countries, particularly as they have an economic recession, very often racist questions come up. We have seen this in France recently. We are also seeing it in Britain very strongly. Dealing with these questions, to me, is very much part of peace education. I also would hope that peace education develops people into being more thoughtful or critical. I do not mean critical in a negative sense. But being able to look below the surface of questions, being able to see that there are many sides to a problem, is also part of the process of peace education.

Thomas Daffern (London, England)

Yes, I think it definitely is possible. In a sense, everything schools do in the field of education and they do well, may be contributing in the end to peace education. We have to consider the contexts in which the whole education process is taking place. But having said that, we need also to think through the relations between different parts of the curriculum, between different educational approaches that can foster that process more than others, and I think a lot of work needs to be done thinking that through. A national curriculum is not per se a bad thing. But at the moment the discussion about our national curriculum seems to have focused on other things. And some of the developments seem potentially detrimental to peace education. History and geography are now optional subjects from the age about 13 – a frightening thought to a historian. And the attitude to language training is dismal. Most of the EEC countries have made two foreign languages compulsory. In Britain, it is only one. Unfortunatey, there is in Britain a kind of insularity and cultural arrogance which does not facilitate peace education efforts.

Morton Deutsch (New York, USA)

Yes, it is possible. In recent years, it has also been increasingly recognized that our schools have to change in basic ways if we are to educate the children so that they are prepared to live in a peaceful world. In my view, there are four key components in the steps and measures needed: cooperative learning, conflict resolution training, the constructive use of controversy in teaching subject-matters, and the creation of dispute resolution centers in the schools.

ÅB: What do you consider to be the basic elements in cooperative learning?

MD: The most important is "positive interdependence". Students must perceive that it is to their advantage if other students learn well. This can be achieved in many different ways, for example, by emphasizing mutual goals and by giving joint rewards. Cooperative learning should also involve providing students with the time and procedures for "processing", analyzing how well their groups function and what can be done to improve how they work together.

ÅB: It is often said that cooperative learning is difficult to arrange and that

it does not prepare students for the adult world, which is frequently described as highly competitive. What is your answer to such comments?
MD: Although the concept of cooperative learning is simple, I would agree that its practice is not. Changing a classroom or a school so that cooperative learning is emphasized is a complex and long-term process, and it requires the teachers to learn many new skills.

That cooperative learning does not prepare for the adult world is often heard, but I would consider that a myth. In fact, the ability of people to work cooperatively is crucial to building and maintaining stable marriages, families, work careers, communities, and a peaceful world. And the issue is not to eliminate competition and individualism but to provide a more appropriate balance with cooperation.
ÅB: The second key component you mentioned was conflict resolution training. What would be some of the important elements in this training in a school setting?
MD: There are many things that could be mentioned as common elements for most conflict resolution training programs. Let me just give a few examples:
(a) Know what type of conflict you are involved in: the pure win-lose conflict; the mixed-motive (both can win, both can lose, one can win and the other can lose); or the pure cooperative (both can win or both can lose). Different types require different strategies. Many conflicts are misperceived as win-lose conflicts.
(b) Become aware of the consequences of violence and of the alternatives to violence.
(c) Try to distinguish between "interests" and "positions". The classic example is that of a brother and sister, each of whom wanted the only orange available. However, the sister wanted the peel to make marmalade; the brother wanted to eat the inner part. Their positions ("I want the orange") were opposed, their interests were not. When conflicting parties take time to discuss their underlying interests, it may be possible to find a solution which suits them both.
(d) Define the conflicting interests between yourself and the other as a mutual problem to be solved cooperatively. Define the conflict in the "smallest" terms possible, as a "here-now-this" conflict rather than as a conflict between personalities or principles.
(e) In communicating, listen attentively and speak so as to be understood. This requires active attempts to take the perspective of the other and to

check continually one's success in doing so.
(f) Be alert to the natural tendencies of both parties to bias, misperceptions, and stereotyped thinking that commonly occur during heated conflict.
(g) Throughout conflict, try to remain a moral person (who is caring and just) and to consider the other as a member of your moral community (entitled to care and justice).
ÅB: You also mentioned "the constructive use of controversy" in teaching subject-matters. Could you give some concrete example of how this may be applied in the classroom work?
MD: David and Roger Johnson have suggested that this is a technique that can be used in many different school subjects and that it will both promote academic learning and the development of skills relevant to conflict resolution.

This is one way this technique could be used: (1) Assign students to groups of four; (2) divide each group into two pairs with assigned positions on the topic to be discussed; and (3) require each group to reach a consensus on the issue and turn in a group report.

First the paired students learn their respective positions; then, each pair presents its position. Next, there is an open discussion where students try to argue strongly for their positions. After this, there is a perspective-reversal and each pair presents the opposing pair's position as persuasively as they can. In the last phase, they drop their advocacy of assigned positions and seek to reach consensus supported by the evidence.

There is good reason to believe that such structured controversy could not only make the classroom more interesting, but that it would also promote the development of perspective taking, critical thinking, and other skills involved in constructive conflict resolution.

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (Quezon City, The Philippines)

I think it is possible and desirable. In fact, peace education should start in the schools if the homes do not take the initiative. As educators we should take it upon ourselves as our primary responsibility to educate for peace. As an initial step we should take stock of the curriculum, go over and reflect on each part of the curriculum: Are the agendas of the curriculum peaceful? Are they conducive to the creation of a peaceful mind? Administrators and faculty should look at the atmosphere and the existing

structures in their schools: What kind of structures are apparent in the school? Are they affirming the dignity of the learner, of the individual, or are they contributing to oppressive systems and relationships?
ÅB: When you think more of the methods in the classroom, what methods would be especially conducive to peace education?
VFC: In terms of methodology in the classroom, teachers should no longer go to the classroom and pose as experts or authorities. Teachers could now start to look at education as a form of dialogue with open discussions and critical reflections, so that there will be a plurality of views, not only what the teacher imposes on the students; that's one point.

Another consideration is for teachers not to put too much emphasis on competition. I have been trying to call the attention of our teachers that most of their motivations are very competitive: "Who has the best paper?", "Who will finish first?", "Who accumulates the greatest number of points?" These are all very aggressive and they don't encourage the spirit of cooperation. If you build up competition in the classroom, you train students to become aggressors. These are some thoughts we could consider.

Celina Garcia (San José, Costa Rica)

Definitely yes, schools could do it. But, I think, first we should be very careful to get rid of all our pre-conceptions of what education means. For me, peace education – as I said before – is a total transformation, and we should begin to transform ourselves, to leave behind all the patterns of sexism and racism, to leave the patterns of making a division between those who have our type of education and those who don't have type of our education. I think we should come down from our pedestal of self-glorifying knowledge that separates us from those wrongfully called illiterate. When we build up an education that is acceptable to all of us, as a human family, to me that would be the first steps towards peace education. And I think maybe Costa Rica would be an example of a country that would do it. Maybe in the next 25 years, we may have gained a lot in many areas: liberating ourselves from sexism that's a great step; liberating ourselves from racism; and establishing some kind of an education that is more adapted to the needs of our century, taking care of the environment too.

Henk B. Gerritsma & Daan Verbaan (Groningen, The Netherlands)

DV: Schools can contribute to peace education in different ways. First you have to find teachers who are willing to teach their pupils about international problems. Several teachers can develop a project together. The development of education materials can be helpful to teachers who want to set up a project in their school. Another possibility to assist teachers is to organize specific teacher-training courses around these subjects.

One strategy outside school is trying to influence methods and curricula on the level of educational planning. Therefore, it can be useful to take part in curricula-development commissions, trying to put subjects related to international problems into the school curricula.

HG: I think, as appears from my previous answer, that it is possible for schools to contribute to peace education. In the same answer I referred indirectly to some conditions. Those conditions are: a) Availability of teaching materials, which have been developed in cooperation with teachers/schools, and which are attuned to distinct age groups, existing subjects and curricula, and to the timetable. b) Availability of teachers' manuals, with instructions about the use of those materials. c) Availability of a curriculum, based on experiences gained in school practice. d) Supply of courses for teacher training and of other possibilities to support teachers with regard to political conflicts and problems. e) Recognition of, or at least consent to, peace education projects from educational authorities.

Haim Gordon (Beer-Sheva, Israel)

Well, very possible if they do what I suggested before – start educating for justice and doing character education. And steps and measures to be taken would be to start educating teachers about the importance of this whole concept of peace education and education for justice and its linkage to character formation. That would take some time, but that would be the first steps.

ÅB: If you think of steps and measures within the classroom that would mean some peace education, how would you picture a teacher working ideally?

HG: Initially it would be quite simple. I would have the teacher get involved in encounters. If it is a Jewish teacher with Jewish students, they

would meet with Arabs and get to know each other under non-threatening circumstances – and vice versa. That would be one of the easier ways to begin. Then the task would be to try to generalize from that experience to other experiences, dealing with world-wide threats and social justice in the global society.

Magnus Haavelsrud (Tromsø, Norway)

Yes, but that is probably the most problematic thing of all, that the very thing that I would ideally have liked to happen to peace education, namely that the content was developed from the pupils' own interests, ideals and hopes, seems to be hard to implement at school. There seems to be a built-in idea that if you are to teach somebody something, the content must be determined in advance. This kind of prescribed instruction, which Freire calls "bank instruction", is so deeply ingrained in everyone who works at school that they are unused to conducting a dialogue that attempts to include the pupils' own subjective reactions towards the world.

This doesn't apply only to people, but also to the way the educational system is organized. The pupils are organized into classes, time is divided into specific periods and the content is organized as subjects, and the kind of dialogue that I would like is seriously impeded by those three things.

ÅB: So far, you have mainly emphasized that it's difficult or impossible to attain your ideal of a dialogue. But what should be done in order to make *some* progress? What should be changed first of all?

MH: It's important to make the pupils more active and to take part when the pre-conditions for the development of the content are laid down. In addition, the content at school should deal with the future as well as the past. We should talk about active social changes, strategies for changing society, whether on the local, national or global level. I think we have moved a little bit in that direction. I do think we have become somewhat more dialogic.

Ian M. Harris (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA)

Yes, I do think it is possible for schools to contribute to peace education. I think, basically, that we do not teach our young people how to deal with conflict. I teach a course at the University called "Male identity" that looks

at various social forces that help shape the masculine identity, and I often ask my students the following question: What do you think of when you think of a man who is angry? I think of Clint Eastwood pulling out a gun and blowing away everybody near him. Life is frustrating – there are difficult moments in it – and we don't teach young people how to deal with those frustrations. I think there are a variety of techniques we can teach young people, about how to deal with conflict, how to deal with frustrations, how to deal non-violently with difficult situations. We really need to do this because at least here in the U.S. we are surrounded by a violent culture. When a man doesn't get his way, he becomes violent and forces other people. This is a very common image that we see in this country. I think that schools can teach young people communication skills, how to express themselves in ways that don't put other people down, teaching them win-win negotiation strategies and contradicting a dominant culture based on violence. These types of learnings are more what I would call affective learnings in the affective domain than they are cognitive.

In the cognitive domain I also think it's important to use peace education to debate controversial issues, to help people learn how to develop rational arguments and defend their positions. As one of the methods of peace education, take a position on the INF treaty or some war or various other conflict situations in the world, and create a class where students can take different positions, arguing for the correctness of their positions. Such activities introduce students to the complexity of foreign policy debates. The purpose of those activities is to introduce students to alternatives, show them there *are* alternatives to violence; we don't always have to be violent. I think that schools can be an important place to introduce those kinds of alternatives.

Petra Hesse (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)

Yes, in terms of content I think it's definitely possible for schools to make room for peace education, and I don't see peace education as something that's simply added to children's curricula. I think that's important, and I think we have been working on a very integrated curriculum in our work. Issues of conflict and peace and conflict resolution turn up in all parts of the curriculum, so it's no longer just restricted to social studies, but you can talk about a conflict when you talk about math. You can use simple clas-

sification tasks, asking children to bring in pictures of people from different countries. You can combine basic math instruction that occurs in elementary school, teaching children to add and subtract and things like that, with introducing children to other cultures. I really think this is possible throughout the curriculum: whether it's in music, and you sing songs about other cultures; or whether it's in literature, where you read stories from other cultures or show children and families from other cultures; or whether it's in art education, where you may show children art from different cultures.

ÅB: So you feel it's very possible to introduce peace education materials in various subjects and at various school levels. If you think of it in terms of outcome, has there been research related to the results of peace education?

PH: There are a lot of impressionistic accounts where people describe what a peace education program has achieved in their classrooms or in the school system. But I'm not personally aware of any more systematic evaluation research. And there are great difficulties in such work. Are you going to conduct questionnaires with kids and ask them about their attitudes? Then you meet with that old problem again: how do the attitudes translate into action, and is there a relationship between the two? Or do you measure results in terms of incidents of conflict and violence in the classroom?

ÅB: Such evaluation attempts have not been part of your own studies?

PH: No, but there's beginning to be more pressure on me to do that. I've answered your main question in terms of content in the classroom. But there is also the more difficult issue of convincing school personnel. I think a lot of people, as I said, are motivated and really feel a need to have programs on peace education, but I find that it's still hard to get whole school systems to implement programs of peace education. Dedicated teachers who care about peace issues do implement programs in their own classrooms and maybe sometimes enlist some other teachers in their schools, but it may be very hard to actually implement peace education on a large scale, persuading a whole state, for example. At least in this country there is a lot of struggling around it.

David Hicks (Bath, England)

I remember that when I came to an IPRA conference in the late 70s and to

the Peace Education Commission, there were several people who gave me the distinct impression that we could not talk about peace education in schools, that it would be a contradiction in terms, that by definition schools promoted structural violence. Schools are, however, quite a significant arena for debate, although it is difficult to introduce reforms. But obviously, I am not quite pessimistic. Steps and measures, in my experience, for empowerment can be good in-service work with teachers, for example, a residential weekend, where one has time with a group of teachers. They enjoy looking at their own practice and process, using the procedures of peace education as part of in-service. The sharing, the support, the debate, the dealing with controversy is something which many teachers find very stimulating. Whenever possible, we try to work with more than one teacher from a school. Obviously head teachers have an important role to play. Certainly I have seen in some places clear examples where good in-service work, supportive head teachers, and a positive approach from the local authority really did promote some exciting things in the school.

Kathleen Kanet (New York, USA)

Do I think it's possible? Do I think the kingdom will come? Well, we are going to move toward it – we are marching on. Part of my experience says that it's going to have to come from the grassroots – but part of me sometimes longs for somebody to come from the top and legislate and say: It must be done and then everybody falls in line. I think that when grassroots initiatives happen that there is more networking and linking and bringing together so that we can learn from one another. A step that would be necessary is more organizational coordination of grassroots initiatives.

ÅB: If you think of it from the classroom level, what would be some of the steps and measures for the individual teachers to take in order to make contributions here?

KK: I think the teacher needs to be committed to learning and growth for herself or himself. I think then she needs to continually ask herself the question: What is peace education and what needs to be done? Linking with others, maybe joining an organization or forming a coalition with another group is important; a formal study group or a support group. To me teacher education is the key. It is the responsibility of the teacher to seek information, joining organizations such as COPRED, going to workshops,

putting themselves in places where these questions are being asked.

Søren Keldorff (Aalborg, Denmark)

Yes, I do think it's possible, and I think that cross-cultural studies are a good way to start, particularly teaching about the developing countries in the third world. The students have been prepared for this kind of teaching by watching TV, and things like starvation, soil erosion, the devastation of the rain forest, the extermination of animal species, the lack of pure drinking water etcetera are very obvious to them. It's also fairly easy to see that rearmament and investment in the death machines of Western culture counteract the possibility of coming to terms with these negative trends of development.

On the other hand, I don't think it's advisable to start with the atom bomb, an imminent third world war between the two superpowers, the Danish defense or NATO. Those things tend to cause too much anxiety, and they counteract motivation, since there is very little the individual pupil can do here, especially in the school environment. But I do think that once you have laid a solid foundation consisting of cross-cultural studies and learning about the developing countries, you can proceed to the military problems in our own culture.

ÅB: Could you say something more about teaching materials in this area in Denmark?

SK: There are excellent teaching materials about the developing countries. What is eminently lacking is a holistic view that links the problems in the third world with, for example, the Western model of government and militarism that is in the process of impoverishing the third world just now. The gigantic foreign debts of these countries have mainly been caused by investing in a defense and security model that even we – the richest countries in the world – can no longer afford.

There is a frightening lack of teaching materials of this kind that gather the perspectives together into a holistic view. And it takes a lot of professional courage and sleepless nights for the individual teacher to be able to construct, and to teach according to, such a holistic view.

Herbert C. Kelman (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

I certainly think that it's possible. I don't have any very sparkling ideas about the steps, but I think it's a combination of things. One of them is development of programs. I know there are a lot of efforts, with which I am not intimately familiar, but I know there are efforts to develop all kinds of programs, curricula, readings. On the whole, I have the impression that there is some very creative, good thinking being done. That is obviously step no. 1. I think it can probably be improved, but I think there are such efforts and I would want to see those enhanced.

The next step is really in part a political task: persuading school systems and the communities within which they operate to introduce these programs into the schools. Partly of course the task is one of teacher training, developing the skills to teach the curricula, because, no matter how good the curriculum prepared by some central team, its ultimate value depends on the personnel who apply it. But the other part is to persuade school systems to adopt the programs. These are simply the old problems of resistance to innovation in any kind of institution; by and large I would imagine that teachers and principals, like any other group of people, have at least mixed feelings about people coming in and trying to revolutionize their curricula.

There is also the broader political problem relating to the question of what is proper and improper for schools to do. I know that the whole issue of education about nuclear war has been a matter of great controversy, and I think the answers are not very simple. I don't think that one can introduce a curriculum dealing with questions of war and peace that is value free. I just don't see how it can be done. I can only counter any criticism by saying that nothing we introduce in the schools related to social science or history, or to politics or civics, is value free. One may have to confront these issues head on, but I think there is a need for some good thinking about them. We don't want the schools to engage in indoctrination, although they always have been and the question may be only: on whose behalf do they indoctrinate and on behalf of what ideology? There are those who accuse the people who want to introduce programs on peace education of politicizing the schools. But schools have been politicized all along and they have been indoctrinating children in a particular ideology. I am not saying that we can avoid this question; it is a serious issue and I think one needs to address oneself to it. It is probably something that can not be left entirely to the politics of each individual community. Some general thinking has to be

done about that. I am answering the question of what are some of the steps that need to be taken, and I think one has – at the level of the individual community – to be sensitive to these concerns, but one has to be creatively sensitive. In other words, we should neither say: "We won't do anything that might get somebody upset"; nor should we say: "Well, we'll do whatever we think is right and let's not worry about people getting upset." It's the same set of problems, broadly speaking, as those involved in sex education. I think that this is a set of issues that should be addressed at the local level, but I also think that somebody needs to do some broad thinking about it.

Alberto L'Abate (Florence, Italy)

I think, as we have seen, that it is very possible. Perhaps the first steps are to train the teachers. What we are trying to do, for example with our association for peace in Florence, is to give teachers and teacher students training in non-violence and to use new teaching techniques, for example, brain-storming or cooperative games, teach them how to use research for peace education purposes etc.There are now also two different networks in Italy: One for peace education and one for training in non-violence. We are trying to work together, so that people who are working in these fields can exchange experiences.
ÅB: Are the members of these networks teachers?
AL: Yes, most of them are teachers. In the network for training in non-violence, there are many activists who are not teachers. The group for peace education consists mostly of teachers. But the two groups are interconnected. I think those groups are important, because if you teach in a different way you have to feel that you are not alone. You have to have contact with others who do similar things.

Linda Lantieri (New York, USA)

Yes, it is possible and I think if we are to survive as a nation and as a world, it is a necessity. As I look back at our process here in New York City, probably one of our most important steps was to involve parents, community people, teachers, administrators, the Central Board, the Local

School Board, experts in the field in a collaborative effort – that I think was the key. Educators for Social Responsibility have been equal partners in this endeavor from the start.

A second step that was important was that we gave teachers 40 hours training, since we realized that we were embarking on some very new concepts and that the teachers themselves had not gotten this in their own education. We needed to show them how to look at some of these issues and have them begin to practice these skills and create conflict resolution for themselves before they could begin to teach these things in the classroom. In our program we also had every teacher visited ten times in the classroom by an expert who encouraged, demonstrated and inspired teachers to take this step.

ÅB: And then when you think about what kind of steps and measures the teacher would use with the children, what kind of methods do you mainly work with?

LL: We mainly use what we call affective approaches; we use methods and approaches that are highly experiential, where young people for example are imagining what things would be like if they approached a situation differently. We use the esthetics also, drawing and music. Mainly we use approaches that are very highly involving; we rarely use just discussion. We use what we call a workshop approach where we have a variety of affective strategies that help kids look at the issues that we are trying to deal with. We use lots of role-playing of conflict situations and practice creative and nonviolent responses to conflict. We role-play and practice how to interrupt prejudice when we see it. We also encourage teachers to use "teachable moments", when issues around them in the classroom or the world relate to the concepts we are teaching.

Max Lawson (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia)

Yes. One way to work is at the curriculum level. The New South Wales Department of Education have had committees identifying all the areas and existing subject courses which may deal with issues falling under the umbrella of peace education and have written handbooks and manuals for distribution in schools. Another way to go is to use courses in personal development with materials drawn for humanistic psychology, dealing with active listening, conflict resolution, breaking down stereotypes.

There is also a subject in the higher school certificate (or the matriculation to university certificate), called general studies, which counts as half a subject and which students are encouraged to do and in fact many students do take. This course deals totally with contemporary issues and many of the concerns of peace education come up in this specific course: for example, human rights, the work of Amnesty International, the pros and cons of uranian mining in Australia, questions of nuclear disarmament. It is the official policy not to have a special subject called peace education and indeed most educators in Australia would agree with this; separate courses on peace education or peace studies being reserved for teachers colleges and universities. Nevertheless, students in the general studies might be quite good at answering questions dealing with peace studies themes.

Stig Lindholm (Copenhagen, Denmark; Sweden)

It is often said that peace education should not be a separate subject, and I agree. But I think that at the stage where we are just now, we must come up with some so-called publicity stunts, that is we must resort to specific measures that catch people's attention. I think there should be special days that focus on the theme of peace, illustrating it and making it visible. Then I wish that peace and development could be discussed in all the subjects, not least in natural science – I am thinking about chemistry and physics, for example. There are many contexts where that aspect could be brought up, and I suppose the question of how to bring it up also affects teacher training.

One difficulty that we ran into in teaching about the developing countries was that the teacher should be objective and, at the same time, create a positive attitude towards aid to developing countries and an understanding of the predicament of the poor countries. I suppose you encounter the same problem in working with questions of peace. I think it is important that the person whom the students meet is really committed, and I would like people representing various perspectives to be invited (the national defense, peace movements, Amnesty, the Red Cross, for example), so that committed people representing different positions might be given a chance to have their say.

Then, of course, we are always short of time at school; there are so many things that compete for a place in the curriculum. So what the schools can

do, I suppose, is to give the students a stimulating push, and then, hopefully, they will join groups that work with these issues: peace movements, political parties (there are, after all, people who are interested in peace in all the political parties), groups within various professions working for peace, Amnesty, the Red Cross etc. I think the main part of the work has to take place outside school, but the students' interest could be aroused at school so that they got more involved. Since it seems to me that the school curriculum is quite jammed, you cannot expect the schools to take on just any amount of work. What they can do, however, is to provide basic knowledge and create an interest, so that the students go on on their own, outside school.

ÅB: You mentioned in passing the role of natural sciences at school. Could you enlarge on that a little?

SL: Both physics and chemistry have relevant information about nuclear weapons, for example. Chemistry and biology are important when it comes to CB weapons, which tend to be overlooked, I think. I'm tired of the constant fixation on nuclear weapons. Of course, they are very important. But I'm afraid that while we are devoting ourselves to nuclear weapons and fighting them with all our might, chemical and biological weapons can be developed in peace and quiet; we also have to take the so-called improvement of conventional weapons into account. I think it is about time we widened our frame of interest a little bit, and physics, chemistry and biology are directly connected with this.

I also think it is very important that the economic consequences of armament should be discussed. I would like Inga Thorsson's reports – asserting, among other things, that civilian production creates more job opportunities than military production – to be taken up, so that this message reaches people somehow.

Naturally social studies and psychology are important subjects in this context. We all know that. But I also find the natural science people and the technologists important, and there you have the professional groups again. Therefore I think that Engineers against Nuclear Weapons is an interesting and important group. You can invite them to talk about the technical aspects. Then you have Physicians against Nuclear Weapons, which is a group with a great impact. Doctors are seen and heard a lot in the mass media, but maybe we should pay more attention to the engineers and use them more. They are a group we do not think about very often in this context.

Mildred Masheder (London, England)

Yes, I think that it is possible. However, I do not share the view that peace education only means education about disarmament or nuclear issues. Basic to me is that peace education should be good education, where good communication, all sort of exercises with listening techniques (creative listening) are included, as well as problem solving techniques.

I would also like to introduce excercises related to "inner peace" (although I know that this view is not shared by all people in peace education). The spiritual side of children is now completely neglected (and then I do not think about narrow religious education). Children need time to reflect; modern life does not give most of them enough quietness.

Multicultural education with emphasis on cooperation and understanding the other's point of view (using role play and drama as techniques) would also be important. The idea is to put yourself into the other's shoes, to be able to understand him or her.

Direct approaches to conflict solving, I think, can begin very early and go on through the years, not attempting to *give* the children the solutions but to train them to work out their own solutions, to sort out the problems themselves. This is a process of real democracy.

ÅB: What is your view about directly dealing with questions about peace, war and disarmament in the classroom?

MM: I feel that when we have got that classroom atmosphere of confidence and support that I see as important, the fears that are obviously present even in quite young children will come out. I think that then they will have the courage to ask about these things. However, I do not think that we should start by giving the young children the adult beliefs, the adult modeling of these problem areas.

Gerald F. Mische (New York, USA)

They can do a great deal. A central concept should be "interdependence". One area deals with *environmental* approaches, demonstrating that we are sharing one common life-support system; we are interconnected on that level. A second area would be *economic* and *monetary* interdependence. Nations cannot solve their problems by themselves. We are all interconnected. We have to teach young people to speak about security in a broader

sense than just military; that the ultimate threat to security is the destruction of the planet's environment which continues.

To understand people's different cultures is important, but I don't believe that understanding people's differences is enough; you can exaggerate in some people's minds the differences. So it is important *how* you present it. Our view is that there is no such things as a "developed" nation, that all nations are developing, and that some of the so-called primitive societies might be more developed in terms of the values that we need to survive today in an interdependent world with heavy environmental problems.

We are planning for the future, and that's where I think justice comes in: justice for our children's children and others that are to live in the future.

I think there is a desperate need for meaning and hope. The drug addiction, the suicides, the violence, the type of ideology that are coming from the new religious right may all be indicators of a desperate need for hope, not just among young people but among teachers and adults. In the confusion and lack of a framework to deal with current and future questions, we say that it's not so much having to come up with specific answers. We believe that many of the answers have to evolve from better understanding and collaboration between nations and through strengthening international systems such as the U.N. An important thing is leadership, to know how to frame the questions, and that is where educators can really play an important role.

Valentina Mitina (Moscow, Russia)

Yes, I think it is possible. But, of course, I think that there are a lot of things that can be done to help the teachers and the students to make it more effective. Sometimes it is a little bit formalized. It is not always very penetrating. As far as our schools are concerned, we have usually oriented this work towards the world outside our country. But I think that peace education should also deal with our internal problems and with peace in our homes. So we have to reorient this kind of education a little bit. To my mind we should also develop such things as teaching the teachers how to teach the students to overcome stereotypes and to develop their critical thinking and such skills as care, responsibility, conflict resolution and others that are necessary for a broad education for peace.

Robert Muller (Escazu, Costa Rica; New York, USA)

There is immensely to do! First by teaching children to behave peacefully towards each other and to get them to understand that some day they might be leaders of nations, that they will work in professions, that they might occupy high positions, that they will be mothers and fathers and that it is *their* peace which is at stake.

Do not let the children despair about the world situation. Tell them that it is in their hands, through their participation, through their volition that things will change. If you let them drift and say that the whole situation is hopeless because of governments, because of institutions, because of the UN or things of this sort, you are not helping children. You have to tell them that this is a matter they have to take in their own hands, that it is going to be their world and that peace is the great challenge they will have to solve in the third millennium. Make them feel proud, responsible and participative. Tell them that they will be the peacemakers of tomorrow, the first peace generation ever.

As for the steps, I would simply show them how humans do already actually cooperate. There are thousands of examples in the United Nations and in its 32 specialized agencies and world programs. The UN system has become the greatest university or universal educational system on earth.

The UN has proclaimed many international days. One simple step in the schools would be to say to the children: Today is the United Nations Human Rights Day (10 December). What do you think about human rights? How do you define human rights? What do you think are *your* human rights? What could the world do? What can the individual do to promote human rights? – On World Environment Day (5 June) you could proudly remember that it was in Stockholm that the first United Nations conference on the environment took place. On International Day of Peace (third Tuesday in September), children could develop peace projects. On World Food Day (16 October) ask children not to eat for a day and to make a little donation to UNICEF. Thus children will know what it means to be hungry.

The great task is to make children participate, to give them to understand that they are not nobodies, but that they can be helpful in the world situation, that they can do something, that what they do and think is going to count in the world.

Your United Nations Association in Sweden can be of great help in all this. They can provide teachers with the list of international days pro-

claimed by the UN. UN Models for students are also great educational means.

Being from Sweden the children should also honor the great Swedes in peace making, for instance Count Bernadotte and above all Dag Hammarskjöld. I am flabbergasted when I go to Stockholm to learn that there is not a Dag Hammarskjöld street or avenue in that city. There should be one in every Swedish city, as there is a John Kennedy street in every US city. I am glad on the other hand that there are Dag Hammarskjöld avenues in other capitals, for example, in Copenhagen. Why not in Sweden? Why not revere and honor one of the great peacemakers Sweden has given to the world? The children should read Dag Hammarskjöld's "Markings" ("Vägmärken"), organize visits to his tomb in Uppsala and visit the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation there. They would be proud to see that one of their compatriots was a hero peacemaker, and they might dream of being some day another Dag Hammarskjöld and doing similar wonders. Is Swedish history teaching about him?

Eva Nordland (Oslo, Norway)

Yes. If it is to be genuine education for peace, it's important that the pupils themselves start by solving problems and are allowed to choose for themselves what problems should be dealt with. For the habits, attitudes and expectations that are built up around this area are to become part of their own personality. Therefore they shouldn't just hear about peace work, it shouldn't just be a text without a context. They must take responsibility themselves, have an opportunity to show concern themselves, and to participate themselves, together with the other pupils.

There are plenty of opportunities for such work in Norwegian schools. Our curricula present no obstacles, and a great deal is actually being done. But in order to reinforce this work, it may be necessary to show what other people are doing, give new groups of teachers a chance to see what is going on, so that they realize that there is so much variation that they don't have to do things the way everybody else does them, but that they can take their own situation as a starting-point: What would suit us? What can we do? In that way the process is initiated, and the reward is in the activities themselves: you experience the happiness of being involved in doing things that are headed in the right direction. The teachers may need the support of

their senior officials or administrators at the beginning to see whether they can be of any assistance to them in some practical matters.

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima, Japan)

Yes, it's possible. It's difficult in Japan, because the Minister of Education imposes certain restrictions or constraints on teachers by guidelines, and teachers are required to stick to these in their teaching. They cannot deviate too much from these guidelines, which are very nationalistic and self-centered. But at the same time I think that *if* the teachers were well trained in peace education, or *if* they spent two or three months in a course on peace education or peace research during the summer period, perhaps in another country, then perhaps the guidelines formulated by the government I think, would, not be equally constraining, and the teachers could do a lot for peace education.
ÅB: Would you think that there would be a possibility in Japan to influence the school system or the guidelines for teaching so that there would be more peace education?
MO: At the moment: No. As long as the liberal-democratic party continues to rule, it is, I think, absolutely impossible to influence this. Katsuya Kodama reported in Nagasaki, when we had the peace education conference ten days ago, that in Sweden, peace education is even encouraged by the school authorities. Unless the government changes from the liberal-democratic party to the socialist party, for example, this is not possible in Japan. So we are hoping for a change of government.

Priscilla Prutzman (Nyack, New York, USA)

Yes, it is possible. To me, the first thing that needs to be done is teacher training. The teachers need to be trained and supported in doing this work, and that includes several hours of training, ideally 20-30 hours of training for all the teachers who want to do this. I do believe it should be voluntary. Then consultants like myself should go back into the schools and help teachers work out the problems that they might see with this. For example, it may be a problem to a teacher, when a school child says that my mother tells me that I should hit back. We help teachers deal with that kind of a

comment and show them that we are looking at alternatives here. We don't judge the children or say that you are bad if you fight, but rather help them to look at what happens if you fight. We should continue supporting the programs, continue going back in and saying: How are you doing? We try to make the people who are peacemakers or mediators in the school feel very proud. We have a lot of ceremonies, honoring the mediators or peacemakers. We give them things like globes or t-shirts and hats that make them feel great. I think that's something that outsiders can do – constantly go back there and to support the schools and the teachers. Because schools are always being told that all the problems of the society go back to them, and they are blamed for everything. Instead I think they need constant support in their task, the most important work in the world.

ÅB: Let us think of this question in another perspective – the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first. What can the teacher do in the classroom to contribute to peace education? Could you give some examples of what you are doing?

PP: We usually start out with cooperative games and activities such as cooperative drawing or cooperative creative dramatics. We also practise communication skills, paraphrazing, active listening to others – those are areas to start with. Then we work with self-esteem, starting out with easy affirmation activities such as: Say your name and something you like to do. Then we work towards higher risk activities such as "One thing I am really proud of in my life..." which is much harder to do; we need to build toward that. Then we get into a series of conflict resolution activities. This is a long process where you then work toward the more refined skills of mediation etc.

ÅB: You mentioned "creative dramatics". What do you refer to by that term?

PP: One activity we often start with in the teacher training is called "machine building". In small groups people would work together to create a machine using sounds and motions from the group members. We guess what it is.

Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Berlin, Germany)

I would like to change your question somewhat. I would say: Could normal schools contribute to education for a peaceful life, to a peaceful society, to

peace in relationships? This is a broad concept of peace education – it is not primarily concerned with or related to disarmament education, to problems of the arms race and so on, which is the normal meaning of peace education as thought about by most politicians, for example. So, if I use this broad concept of peace education, I would say: this has to be the basic concept of every school; every school should try to create a climate which is devoted to the definition which I have just given. Secondly a climate in which every pupil or student can say: this is a place which I love, where I like to be, even in my leisure time. We had such experiences before 1933 in some of the "Reformpädagogik"-schools and we know of such experiences even in the post second war area in Germany in small schools, for instance, in schools with only one classroom, the so-called Landschulen. Such schools were not only instruments for society to teach pupils how to behave or what to learn, they were also places of interest, places of leisure, even places of social life for the whole community. This characteristic of being attractive is a very important criterion, and when schools are attractive to pupils, they are also peaceful, as far as I understand this term. Schools should be open, should be places of interest and could be centres of community social life.

ÅB: You see these as important conditions, but are they sufficient? Are there other things that you would like to add to that or do you feel that you have created an education for peace given these conditions?

HR: Schools should be a centre for the life of young people. If this condition is achieved, peace education could work in a more political way as well. Schools could be centres of political actions in a small scale in a way pupils and students have understood political life. Then schools could influence the community. It is a process of giving and taking – from the community to the school, from the school to the community. For me this would be an ideal way of practicing peace education. In big schools, this is impossible or incredible. They are like a waiting hall at a railway station. Given certain conditions as to be found in community education centres, e.g. face to face communication, chances for identification, you'll find children changing their attitudes towards their fellow students, towards staff and towards the building, furniture etc.

ÅB: We know that is very difficult to get these ideal conditions having many big schools. Is there something that you could do in such cases, nevertheless?

HR: O.K., we cannot start with the ideal and optimistic conditions, we have to start with the conditions as they are. What every teacher, every head can

do, without changing conditions, is to give children the feeling that they are valuable, that their opinions do matter and that people will listen to them and do take them into account. Confidence building between teacher and student, cooperation and care are as important as smaller learning groups on a formal level. This is what every education authority or any ministry of education should consider as the part of the individual teacher or the staff of the school, whereas the other part has to put more emphasis on smaller learning groups, on reducing the pupils per teacher ratio. Then some of the problems which we have got in greater communities wouldn't arise. The "normal" big system is not favourable for creating peaceful conditions. To some extent this is a question of money, but it is also a question of political priority. To spend a lot of money for the arms race, for example, is a political decision.

Douglas Ray (London, Ontario, Canada)

I think that it *is* possible. If it is not possible for schools to have an impact on peace education, I do not know what agency in society can be counted on to do the job. I recognize it is very *difficult* for the schools to do it. It is very easy for us to take on more than we can do, to promise more than we can do and therefore disappoint. But I think for us to bow out on that account is unnecessary and probably foolish. Probably the schools are the best agency in society to undertake this task. In the first place we deal with the total population, and we do deal with them at a period in their lives when their ideas are to some extent malleable. We do not have more influence on them than their parents. We do not have more influence perhaps than their peers. But we do have some influence.

I think it is really very important that we should try this. We are probably unnecessarily reluctant; the idea that we are going to promote a particular kind of society would be regarded by many educators as propaganda, and propaganda is a very bad word. On the other hand, I think propaganda is not necessarily different in kind from advertising in any other sense. We advertise to try to get people to buy this or that product. We might advertise similarly to try to get people to believe that peace is a good idea. We certainly do advertise to try to promote health, more exercise, better control and that sort of thing. More fundamental than any of these kinds of things is to try to live a life which will enable us as a human

species to survive on this planet. If that is not an important matter to use propaganda for – I don't know what is.

ÅB: What would then be some of the steps and measures to be taken concretely that you come to think of?

DR: I think one of the most important things is to avoid preaching, talking in abstractions. We have to try to get some kinds of steps that kids can become aware of and can take action in – where they can see the difference and realize that it is worthwhile to try to do this sort of thing. Thus, for example, we can help them to realize that their society is racist or sexist, and that they have a personal responsibility in transforming this. We can show them some new forms of behaviour that they could follow, some new ways of checking their behaviour to see whether or not they have overcome these problems and perhaps to commend them on the progress to help them to participate in this evaluation and transformation of persons who do not follow the code of behaviour which we are to follow.

The way in which this seems most possible to me, is to have the children participate in the government of their school to some extent. Very often we shy away from this, because we realize that kids will not have the same ideas in every sense as we do, and yet it seems likely that many of their ideas will be in fact ahead of ours. We are a little bit too conservative sometimes – unwilling to take some of the steps.

Let me take an example from the Human Rights Education Program which is introduced in grade 4, to students age 9 or 10. We were interested in developing three inter-related concepts: rights, responsibilities and reasonable limitations on these rights. The way in which we worked with this in the schools was to have the kids draw up a class Charter of Rights. They did this by taking a look at, for example, what are the things that you think a person needs in order to survive physically? They would put down things like food, the right to go to the bathroom, the right to sleep and the right to excercise and so on. Then, they noted that these were the same for boys and girls, the same for kids who were disabled or not, the same for kids of different races. Then: What do people need in terms of psychological considerations? Again the children found: Yes, they need love, affection, attention, recognition and so on, and again they noted that all kids need these kinds of things. There are no sex or race or age differences.

Then when they began drawing up their class Charter of Rights, when they began writing out suggestions, everything was challenged. The teacher said: If you claim it to be a right, you cannot deny that right to anybody

else, so if you are going to say: I have the right to the toilet whenever I like, you have to recognize that everybody in this class have that right. The kids quickly began thinking in more differentiated terms; in some cases it is a wish perhaps, but not a right. It is a claim which is not realistic. It has to be subject to a reasonable limitation or I am not willing to accept my responsibility to give to other persons the same right, so the kids quickly became more realistic in their grouping of rights. However, the list of rights which were developed in a particular class, was perhaps not obtained outside that class; in other classes the list might be different. When they went home their parents might not accept that same list. But the children began understanding the relationship between their responsibilities, the question of reasonable limits and rights. And I think that we have to understand that the rights of a Swedish child are not the same as the rights of a Tanzanian child for a variety of reasons. Maybe they should be. But you cannot impose from Sweden the rights on even a neighbouring state and you certainly can not on more distant states. Neither can you blame another society for failing to provide certain rights that you take for granted in Sweden. As early as at age 8, 9 or 10, you can understand some of these concepts, and I think it is important to continue to elaborate on such examples.

Betty Reardon (New York, USA)

Yes, I think so – that is why I work in this field. – One important thing is to foster the questioning of the systems that exist. The students should learn to be reflective and critical. The teachers should begin more consciously to stress two things. The first is that we need to better understand world problems from a world perspective and have a greater knowledge of the global problems threatening the survival of the planet. The second is that we need to develop new policies on the basis of such knowledge, find other ways of doing things. Our present methods aren't working.

Knowledge of cultures outside the European sphere is badly needed. Skills related to conflict recognition and conflict resolution need to be taught like other skills such as language skills. Children meet conflicts early in life and live in a world of conflicts. We need to teach students to deal with conflict in various ways, and to question the necessity of violence to resolve conflicts and defend value.

Tom Roderick (New York, USA)

I think it's quite possible. That's what we're doing in New York City. We are introducing the skills of conflict resolution and inter-group relations into a large, challenging urban school system, and we're having some success with that. An evalution study indicates that changes are happening in individual students, in the climate of classrooms and sometimes even the climate of a school.

But our work would be a lot more effective if schools themselves were restructured in fundamental ways. I think that schools need to be a lot smaller than they are, and that more control needs to be in the hands of the people who are actually in the school – the principal, the teachers, the parents and the children. Right now you have big schools, especially on the high-school level; but even some elementary schools are more like factories than anything else. In fact, they look like minimum-security prisons sometimes. So that's one problem.

ÅB: What would be some of the steps that the individual teachers should take when starting this kind of work in the classroom?

TR: Our approach is to give the teachers a good amount of training (20-24 hours of introductory training in conflict resolution and in teaching conflict resolution to children). We give them a curriculum guide that they can use as a resource-book for planning lessons for their classes.

Then we have consultants who visit classrooms to help the teachers put the curriculum into effect. Even if you give people a good amount of training and a curriculum, there are many pressures that teachers are under, and fears they have about teaching in a different kind of way. They appreciate someone who comes in and holds their hand, demonstrates a few lessons, co-plans lessons with them, and generally provides support. We're talking about a support-person, not a supervisor. There's a role for the supervisor, but this role is to be completely supportive, helping the teachers without evaluating or criticizing.

Paul Rogers (Belfast, Northern Ireland)
& Maura Ward (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland)

Yes, there is much that can be done. Openness is important. School staffs can be helped to be more conscious of the need to promote peace in their

schools. Experts should be invited to the schools to speak to the teachers and students about peace and justice issues in order to raise awareness. The young people in schools should be encouraged to research these issues and, if possible, to become involved in the alleviation of some of the problems. This could be done through an annual peace project inviting young people to investigate various issues, follow them through during the year and present their findings in their class, school or locality.
PR: I agree. Materials are also important. Well planned, well presented teaching materials, appropriate to the age and ability of the students, are vital prerequisites to good peace education. It is now widely accepted that there cannot be good curriculum development without good teacher development and, therefore, teachers are central to developing peace education curriculum.

Bogdan Rowiński (Konstancin, Poland)

Yes, I think it is possible. But schools need good programs for this kind of education, well-trained teachers and, I think, new methods as well.
ÅB: What would be some of the things that you come to think of that a teacher could do in the classroom to promote peace education?
BR: Let's think about 16-17-year-old boys: The teacher can teach them how to solve conflicts in different ways. So when somebody sees something on TV, he is better equipped to evaluate this – he can evaluate the solutions. Maybe he feels that other solutions would be better. The teacher should emphasize that the world is not just one-dimensional. The student should see the world from a perspective of alternatives. Hopefully this makes people more flexible – they will be more ready to listen to the opinions of others.

Paul Smoker (Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA)

I do think it's possible if we are using the word peace education in a sense of imparting knowledge, understanding, theories about peace and conflict. The steps that can be taken depend in large part on the nature of the educational system. In Britain, qualifications are important. (I personally don't like qualifications. There is a hierarchical aspect of this which I find unpleasant. I feel people should study because they are interested in the topic.)

But I recognize that in Britain qualifications are very important and it works two ways. Students benefit, and the subject itself benefits if a course is certified. So it is useful to have a course validated, accepted by an independent neutral examination board. So in the British context, I think that that's the sort of thing that schools can do.

But then of course there is the problem of teacher training. Teachers are so pushed, they are asked to do so much. My experience, which is limited, is that most teachers are very conscientious and very professional; they try to do their very best with the resources available. I think one of the problems for schools in introducing peace education is providing the teachers with adequate materials and with training-courses. I think the colleges of education and other such groups would be the ideal people to do this type of thing, to keep teachers informed about the subject and to help develop good materials that they can then use in the classroom situation.

ÅB: If you think of the steps and measures within the classroom that the individual teacher could do – what comes to your mind first?

PS: There are a lot of things that can be done. The ideal would be, of course, if you had teachers who had done a course in a Teacher Training College in this area and prepared themselves for such activities.

ÅB: When you started answering this question, I noted that you said: It is possible if you think of imparting knowledge, understanding etc. What about the other aspect – education for peace: Do you see this as possible also?

PS: That becomes controversial. Now I think, again in the British experience, that this is much more possible at the junior level. I was trained as a teacher to teach primarily younger children – children under the age of 11, and I prefer that. One of the reasons I prefer that was because I was allowed to do educationally interesting things, experimental work, experiential learning, group work. In Britain a lot of work has been done for education for peace: the Bristol project, the Avon project and others, and I think that it is still possible to do this at the younger level.

When you get to the older level this becomes very difficult to do in the official state schools. You can do it in special schools such as Summerhill, where related work has been done for about 40 or 50 years now. But in most state schools you would not be able to do this, partly because of the structure (most schools are primarily hiarchical, students are not part of the decision-making process etc.), partly because of political reasons (if you were trying to do this, I think there would be an enormous amount of pres-

sure on the teacher to stop doing it). I regret that very much because I actually feel that these two approaches can go along together perfectly well, and I prefer to do both.

Toh Swee-Hin (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

Oh, definitely. Some of the concrete steps are to begin with the teachers themselves; they are the professionals; without teachers there would be no schools. The question to raise is how do we facilitate teachers to move into peace education? We should recognize that teachers may not personally be against peace education, but they may not have had any relevant training or socialization; they may lack skills and awareness to do it effectively. I believe that in general people, including teachers, have a predisposition to live in a more peaceful world. So what we need to do is to encourage processes of self-clarification on what this means in individual, societal, local and global terms and also to give them tools to work with these issues in the classroom. This calls for a lot of inservice work with teachers, where participatory workshops are needed rather than merely giving lectures. We need to engage teachers in dialogue and show them creative ways of doing peace education. That is how we have proceeded in our workshops in the Philippines. On the first day, the teachers may feel a bit strange. But by the third day, having gone through this participatory pedagogy, they feel much more confident. At a stage of self-discovery, they begin to see that peace education is relevant to them, that they can use this or that strategy themselves. So it is always possible. Another thing that is important is to convince administrators, because they are very often real obstacles. Teachers may be willing but can be discouraged by administrators. So we need to attend to people who make decisions.

ÅB: If you think about the steps and measures a teacher has to work with in a classroom in order to bring about peace education, what comes to your mind?

ST: One of the points we always raise with teachers in our workshops is the need to listen to their learners instead of just imposing ideas on them. We should always start from the ideas and feelings of our students, and then the teacher's role is to facilitate the broadering and deepening of the student's understanding. The teacher could later also question or challenge the students, suggesting ideas that they may not have considered before in order to

better understand the wider realities around them. This step-by-step process is critical in my view for effective peace education in classrooms.

Judith Torney-Purta (College Park, Maryland, USA)

I think that distributing and helping teachers to use some of the many and diverse materials now available would be a positive step. The only kind of international education or peace education which is likely to succeed in our country is one which preserves and integrates American ideas about human rights and democracy. It is also necessary to keep in touch with the views of parents and others in the local school district and to be sure that a balance between points of view is represented.

ÅB: There is a feeling in some countries that traditional patriotism as promoted by school teaching may in fact be a barrier against developing attitudes of global solidarity and interdependence. Since you seem to view patriotism more positively, could you comment a little more on this?

JT: It has to be a complementary thing. Students should understand that unilateral actions in the name of patriotism are likely to create trouble in the international system. We have to help them realize that every country has legitimate national interests. Our country should not stop pursuing our interests or our values, but we need to communicate with others, negotiate with them, and sometimes modify our actions. We need increased awareness of the complexity of the international system.

ÅB: What are some of the things you would like to see developed in schools to promote such increased awareness and global perspectives in general?

JT: One way of dealing with these issues in schools is by means of role playing. I work with a computer-assisted simulation where secondary school students take the roles of diplomats of other countries. This seems to be one way of beginning to understand that people in other countries have different views and that the international system is complex. Very important in this field is teacher training. A teacher who is carefully trained in this area knows how to motivate students to acquire and use information, not just memorize by rote.

Lennart Vriens (Utrecht, The Netherlands)

I do think it's possible for schools to contribute to peace education. Just one important thing: Peace education is not only a matter of methods and tricks. Peace education has to do with personal involvement, and I think that in my opinion peace education starts with the development of some basic values, peace values. The base for these values is laid in the family, I think. One important aspect is trust (can we trust people?). You cannot explain trust if you haven't experienced it when you were very young. It's not a verbal experience, it's a pre-verbal experience; it's not a rational experience, it's a pre-rational experience. Solidarity is also an extremely important peace value.

The school can try to develop those values further, but if those values have not been present in the family, then it's very difficult to do this job in school. I think this is the basis of implicit peace education. The school has a special task in dealing with implicit peace education, but it should also deal with explicit peace education.

ÅB: Can you illustrate further the meaning of implicit peace education in school?

LV: A school philosophy must be shaped by peace values. You cannot talk to children in a meaningful way about social justice if the school system is not a social-justice system. And you cannot talk effectively with children about non-violence, if the school system itself is violent. I think these attitudes and skills should be there before schools introduce children systematically to the political problems of the world. So I think that when school starts, peace education should deal with everyday experiences in the children's own lives. Then, when children are 10-11 years old, they want information about the political problems, and I think schools should introduce them and try to give children the tools and the skills to understand these political problems. So I think schools have very important tasks.

ÅB: You have talked about skills, knowledge and values. Do you also see peace education as something to do with action? Should you as a teacher inspire children to act according to these values?

LV: This I am not so sure about. I'm not sure whether peace education should lead children into action. Maybe this can be a consequence, but I think then it must be an action of the children themselves – I think peace education must not stress children into actions approved by adults. You should be careful here, because there's a kind of gray zone between what's

peace education and what's indoctrination. We are responsible for the children, and we must take a careful position: we must teach them to think about the problems, we must invite them to come to a standpoint of their own, but we must not be too specific in our own influence.

Riitta Wahlström (Jyväskylä, Finland)

Yes, I think that it is quite possible for schools to contribute to peace education. It is possible to teach the pupils about different countries and cultures in a way that makes them understand the cultural roots, the different religions and ideologies. This is important in order to understand the existing differences between people as well as their basic common needs and similarities. It is also possible to give the pupils basic knowledge about important global problems, such as the pollution problem, the extreme poverty and hunger, the exploitation and spoiling of the environment, the risks connected with armament and nuclear war. However, I think that this kind of knowledge should mainly be for the older pupils in our schools, not for children at the primary level.

An important aspect of education in this respect is how we approach our pupils. We should not just hand over a package of knowledge. Instead, we should start with the problems our pupils have in their own minds and in their own reality, in a way similar to the pedagogies of Freinet and Freire, where people are encouraged to find solutions to problems that are important to them and to search for knowledge that is of use in this process.

A major aim is to make this world better; and I think that this aim of making the world a better place, with equality, justice and a healthy environment, is to be kept in mind in our efforts to deal with various minor problems and in our efforts to acquire meaningful knowledge. A major step in peace education is to start thinking about the world as we want it to be.

AB: You have been studying such characteristics as moral values and self-esteem in your research. How do you look upon the relations between knowledge, moral values and self-esteem and the importance of taking these aspects into account in our schools?

RW: I think that it is no use getting knowledge about the problems of the world if you do not have human rights and equality as basic values. Knowledge of different cultures and different countries may be of little importance from the peace education point of view if you do not have this

kind of moral orientation, valuing human dignity, equality and justice.

It has been said and written many times in discussions of peace education that it is important to have self-esteem first. I think that self-esteem might be important, but it is not enough for anyone to want to make this world better for others than him- or herself. In fact, I suppose that there are many people with high self-esteem in the world, in high power positions, whose actions are characterized by exploitation and racism, and who are supporting militaristic solutions of the conflicts. So the idea of self-esteem as the most important starting-point for peace education might not be correct. Instead, I would like to emphasize the importance of moral development and education related to values.

I have been strengthened in this view by results from my empirical studies, where I found no relationship among the boys studied between self-esteem and positive attitudes to peace or peace activities. On the other hand, relationships *were* found – as I mentioned before – between the level of moral judgement and activities and attitudes related to peace. Of course, I cannot generalize my results, because the data and methods were restricted.

Zlmarian J. Walker (Brasilia, Brazil)

I think it is both possible and necessary. Steps to be taken are many. Working with teachers I think is the easiest first step, because many teachers are aware that there are some missing elements in what they give the students, and many of them are sincerely concerned with the world situation. They don't always know *how* to teach about it or what to do.

Maybe the second step is to create more instructional materials. I have published a book in this area, which is very tiny and very insignificant, but I know that there are people thinking about it now and starting to work on materials. So far we don't have real publications in the area; we don't have teacher manuals; we don't have practical exercises.

The third step would be to arrange curriculum development groups to present curricular materials to local, state or national authorities. I have been talking with some friends about a national curriculum project, and we will probably do something of this sort, but I think that local and state approaches might be easier.

ÅB: If you think at the level of a specific classroom, what do you think the

teacher could do to enhance peace education?
ZW: I guess I just talk about what we have done. We do this in two ways: we have special activities and we do things within the regular curriculum. The special activities generally emphasize United Nations days and similar events, so we arrange programs about those events, do research related to this, and discuss. Within the regular classroom activities we use cooperative frameworks, and we work with sexism and racism. Our classrooms are very diverse, which is excellent, but the teachers really have to be aware of the problems implicit in such a situation. Teachers have to organize their daily activities to make sure that everyone is included and that the children are consciously aware that people are being included because they have something to offer. We try to promote the view that diversity is something wonderful, we do cooperative games and try to avoid too much competition. I try to stimulate the teachers; I give them materials; I train them; but they are really responsible for their own work.
ÅB: So in general you think peace education is something that could and should be included in various subjects and should not be a specific subject?
ZW: In elementary school I don't think it should be a specific subject. In higher grades it may sometimes be especially emphasized in one particular subject.

Christoph Wulf (Berlin, Germany)

In my view, peace education in schools is possible and necessary. For one thing, it can be a teaching principle that is important in all school subjects, containing as it does perspectives and criteria, to the realization of which the total educational activity in schools must contribute. Peace education can also bear fruit through intensive work on attitudes and values and by providing basic knowledge in the relevant areas. Finally, if the structures of violence found in the school itself are turned into themes for discussion this may help to clarify the experiences of school and to enrich the lives of the students.

Richard Yarwood (London, England)

Yes, it's not only possible, but I think it's crucial, really. There are all sorts

of ways that it can happen, but I suppose a natural first way for an individual teacher is to gain some staff support, so that you actually have a group of teachers in the school who are keen to introduce peace education. – If the curriculum doesn't allow them to introduce a subject around peace education, they can work to set up situations within the school for debate of these issues. In most schools, particular secondary schools, there are opportunities in the sixth form study periods and in personal, social skill sessions to introduce these kind of topics. If there is a sympathetic head teacher, you may try to have it as a properly planned course rather than single inputs.

The people who organize the criticism and resistance against peace education have been working very hard on school governors (governers being parents and people in responsible positions in the community) to try to make sure that school governors are aware of the peace education "problem" and to get governors voted on who are against peace education. This work could be counteracted to some extent by open discussions about the real meaning of peace education.

ÅB: Do you think of peace education as something that should be dealt with in a particular peace studies subject, or do you think of it as something that should be part of most subjects in the school?

RY: Pragmatically, we try to fit it in where we can, really, and the easiest way to do it is often within a set course. However, ideally the methods of peace education are as important as the content, and the methods of peace education in my opinion should be integrated into all sorts of subjects. But in terms of specific topics, a specific course has the advantage of demonstrating the holistic nature of the issues, how they interrelate. But this does not mean that you should not take up relevant questions in other subjects, for example, a debate on the moral implications of nuclear power in physics.

ÅB: At the present time, to what extent are there such specific peace studies courses in British secondary schools?

RY: We have various examination boards covering regions, and there do exist within some of these examination boards, peace study components in courses. I don't know how many there are, but it's really only a handful.

ÅB: Would these courses always be options or would they be compulsory?

RY: They would be optional courses.

Nigel Young (Hamilton, New York, USA)

Yes, schools can make important contributions. I mentioned this project in Leicestershire. Making a local issue global and a global issue local are examples of what I would call a good entry into peace education. For example, the children may be made aware of how their food may be tied into a system of deprivation and oppression or structural violence. They may be made aware of how war toys are part of a military culture.

ÅB: Is there anything written about this Leicestershire project?

NY: Yes, David Selby, at the University of York, has described it in his publications on world studies.

References

Bjerstedt, Å. The "didactic locus" of peace education. *Didakometry*, No. 74, 1993. (a)

Bjerstedt, Å. Fifty peace educators: Self-portraits in passing from twenty-two countries. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 7, 1993. (b)

Bjerstedt, Å. Peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 8, 1993. (c)

Bjerstedt, Å. Teacher training and peace education. *Peace Education Miniprints*, No. 55, 1994.